

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## VIRGINIA NATIONAL PARKS ACT

**HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce legislation that responds to the concerns of Virginians regarding national parks in the Commonwealth. The Virginia national parks bill confronts a number of Virginia's pressing park issues, addressing Shenandoah National Park, Richmond National Battlefield Park, Shenandoah Valley National Battlefields, and Colonial Parkway.

First, my bill addresses constituent concerns about the expansion of Shenandoah National Park and Richmond National Battlefield Park. These two parks share an unusual status in that they are each a relatively small park with a much larger authorized boundary. The result of this situation is that, unlike the vast majority of national parks, these parks can expand whenever they want, without congressional approval or proper representation of local communities' interests.

While Shenandoah National Park includes 196,000 acres of land, its enormous 1926 authorized boundary includes 521,000 acres, enveloping parts of many surrounding communities. Similarly, while Richmond National Battlefield is composed of several small sites surrounding Richmond, its sprawling 1936 authorized boundary includes about 250 square miles of the metropolitan area.

Many citizens and local governments within the authorized boundaries of both the Shenandoah and Richmond parks fear that there is a cloud hanging over local property titles and that the parks could expand without a fair consideration of the local communities' concerns. My bill would put to rest these fears by amending the two parks' authorized boundaries to conform to the land that the National Park Service currently owns. This legislation doesn't preclude future expansion of these parks. It simply gives the people most affected by park expansion a proper voice in the decision. I believe that these provisions will relieve the longstanding tensions between these parks and their neighbors and promote more cooperative and fruitful relationships.

Another provision of my bill responds to a Virginia General Assembly resolution asking for legislation to allow for the maintenance of secondary roads inside Shenandoah National Park. Since the park's inception in 1935, Virginia has maintained and operated secondary roads in the park under a series of temporary-use permits. These permits have recently expired and the National Park Service has not renewed them, leaving the State without permission to maintain the roads. Many of these secondary highways are regularly traveled by school buses and are badly in need of repairs and safety improvements. My bill returns these roads to the State so that they can be properly maintained.

The legislation I introduce today also incorporates the provisions of the Shenandoah Valley National Battlefields Partnership Act, legislation sponsored by Congressman WOLF, which passed the other body last year. This legislation conserves for future generations 10 Civil War battlefields of the Shenandoah Valley. Importantly, the act accomplishes these goals without infringing on the rights of private property owners. This legislation establishes partnerships between Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector to conserve and interpret the legacy of some of the most vital battlefields of the Civil War.

Another provision of my bill authorizes the National Park Service to buy a small plot of land for the Colonial Parkway near James-town.

The Virginia national parks bill addresses the concerns of Virginians on a variety of issues pertaining to national parks and I welcome the support of my colleagues in cosponsoring this legislation.

## REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

**HON. HAROLD ROGERS**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 23, 1995*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 450), to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes:

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995, but I would like to make clear what this bill does and does not do.

First, what the bill does do. This legislation will place a temporary hold on regulations which are currently under promulgation by Federal agencies. These regulations—which number more than 65,000 pages per year—are literally choking the economic growth of the Nation and must be looked at.

Again, this is a temporary hold. We are simply saying that the redtape machine needs to stop for a few months so we can see if these regulations are helping or hurting the American people. I would bet that many homebuilders, roadbuilders, and oil and gas entrepreneurs in my district would say that the redtape of regulation is definitely hurting.

However, there are clear limits to what this bill applies to. For instance, the bill explicitly states that no regulations “which would prevent an imminent threat to health or safety” would be affected by this legislation. In fact, I spoke to the chairman of the committee that wrote this bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CLINGER, to ensure that these provisions were part of the final package.

But in order to ensure that critical safety regulations pending at the Mine Safety and

Health Administration [MSHA] would not be affected, I will vote for an amendment during floor debate which will exempt such actions from the bill. These include important rules requiring better ventilation to avoid buildup of methane gas and restricting the use of diesel equipment to avoid coal mine fires. I simply feel that protecting the health and safety of our miners requires this added protection.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am supportive of efforts to put a hold on the regulation steamroller known as the Federal Government. I only wanted to clarify for my colleagues that important rules regarding health and safety would not be impacted.

## LAKE GEORGE, IN, WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN

**HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to authorize the development of a comprehensive watershed management plan for northwest Indiana's Deep River Basin, which includes Deep River, Lake George, Turkey Creek, and other related tributaries. The communities of Hobart, Lake Station, and Merrillville, IN, would greatly benefit from the implementation of this plan.

The sediment cleanup of Lake George was first authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99-662, and the project has received Federal funding since 1990. The project includes flood control, environmental enhancement, and recreational development for an area that comprises the 282-acre Lake George, Turkey Creek, and Deep River in the vicinities of Hobart and Lake Station, IN.

However, the successful completion of the Lake George project is dependent upon a detailed, comprehensive investigation of the watershed, beyond the scope of the existing Lake George study authority. The legislation I am introducing today would facilitate the evaluation of how to sufficiently control the current and long-term sediment quality and quantity, address chronic flooding problems and the safety of Lake George Dam, and ensure the proper management of endangered wetlands.

In addition, a comprehensive watershed management plan is essential to determine the placement of sediment traps for the authorized Lake George project. Taxpayer dollars would be saved by instituting effective land use management techniques and trapping sediments before they reach Lake George. It is possible that sediment flow could be relieved in the unauthorized tributaries. In sum, future costs could be drastically reduced by developing and implementing a comprehensive management plan, which would result in less costly sediment traps and much

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

needed flood relief for the communities of Hobart and Lake Station, IN. Additionally, the development of a comprehensive plan could alleviate the need for a costly dredging of Lake George in the future.

It is my hope that this bill will enhance our ongoing efforts to develop and implement sound, reasonable, and long-term solutions to the watershed management problems faced by the Lake George area, as well as the rest of northwest Indiana. I would hope to have your support, and the support of my other colleagues in the House of Representatives, in advancing this important legislation.

#### COUNTRY OF ORIGIN MARKING REQUIREMENT FOR SEMICONDUCTORS

##### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, I introduced H.R. 947, a bill which would exclude semiconductors and their containers from the country of origin marking requirements under existing trade law. Semiconductors, as classified under headings 8541 and 8542 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, include diodes, transistors, integrated circuits, and microassemblies.

Country of origin markings for semiconductors present both cost and compliance problems for U.S. industry. While the cost of marking semiconductors is not great when amortized over a production run, the cost is significant in absolute terms. In addition, most of these components are small and therefore, difficult to legibly mark with the requisite producer identification, grade, quality, electrical values, and other symbols, making compliance with these marking requirements very arduous.

One of the original intents of country of origin marking was as a consumer protection measure. However, only a tiny fraction of semiconductors are sold at retail. In general, semiconductor customers are unconcerned about semiconductor origin marking, since they are usually manufacturers who incorporate them into other products without reference to such marking. These customers are concerned about the semiconductor's quality, which is more a function of its producer than its origin.

U.S. marking requirements create difficulties for manufacturers trying to serve both U.S. and European Union [EU] markets. The basis for determining the country of origin for semiconductors differs between the United States and the EU for those semiconductors that are not wholly produced within one country. Therefore, these producers may violate the EU law when shipping semiconductors to the EU that are marked according to U.S. standards. The reason is that EU member states, while not requiring marking, do require that a product not be mislabelled.

For example, the producer may diffuse circuit patterns on a wafer in one country, mount and encapsulate the chips in a second country, and import the semiconductors to the United States for final testing. These products may then be sold to domestic manufacturers or foreign purchasers. In this case, the United

States considers the semiconductor the origin of the second country, and under current law, it must be marked accordingly. The EU, on the other hand, considers the country of origin to be the first country. In order not to violate EU law, the producer would have to remove the U.S. required marking before export from the United States, which is a possible violation of U.S. law.

The Semiconductor Industry Association and the American Electronics Association, trade associations which represent the users and producers of semiconductors, support the exemption of semiconductors from country of origin marking requirements not only because of the cost savings, but also because of conflicting rules among our major trading partners. To answer concerns about government's need to know the country of origin for the purposes of administering its national laws, these semiconductor purchasers and users are committed to the development of a uniform coding system to satisfy international origin requirements. Therefore, the effective date of this legislation will be January 1, 1996 to allow for the development of this system.

For all the aforementioned reasons, existing country of origin requirements serve no useful purpose and simply add to the cost of producing and selling semiconductors in the international market. Elimination of these requirements is a simple, effective solution to these problems.

#### CHERRY HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE AND INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

##### HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you a unique program that will encourage the youth of my district to give something back to their community. I am proud to introduce the Cherry Hill Community Service and Involvement Program.

Designed exclusively by students, this program is about helping people. Students will go into the community and work 53 hours of service with various organizations earning 2.5 credits, the equivalent of a semester elective. They will also participate in 12 hours of public policy forums. The program is designed to teach students the skills needed to participate in their community. It also introduces the students to the world of public policy so that they may make informed decisions as a member of the community.

The uniqueness of the program lies within its structure. It is the first service program in New Jersey that was written, researched and implemented by the students at Cherry Hill West High School. This allows the students to have a say in public policy, participate in and take responsibility for their community as they emerge into adulthood. The goal is to make young people productive and active in their community as adults.

I congratulate the students of Cherry Hill West High School on their courage and dedication to embark on such an endeavor. I know that the talents of the students will come through and benefit the entire Camden County area. I encourage other members of this body to endorse similar programs in their districts.

#### REAL REGULATORY RELIEF

##### HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, Republicans continue to move forward with an agenda that strives for less spending, less regulation, and less taxes. We must work to roll back costly and burdensome Federal regulations that suffocate American taxpayers and small businesses. Our Republican Contract With America favors a common sense approach to our regulatory system.

Big Government one-size-fits-all regulations hit at the very heart of our economy impeding growth and job opportunity. Regulations act as hidden taxes on employment. Employers wasting time and money complying with excessive regulation cannot hire new employees or invest in machinery and equipment to make workers more productive. Instead, burdensome regulations create jobs for lawyers and destroy jobs for manufacturers.

Regulations cost the economy an estimated \$600 billion in 1994. That amounts to a \$6,000 tab for every household in the country. Frankly Mr. Speaker, Americans just do not think they are getting their money's worth.

The Regulatory Reform and Relief Act, H.R. 926, introduces rationality to an out of control regulatory system. Republicans have designed a regulatory system that makes sense and requires regulatory agencies to estimate the cost to businesses of regulatory compliance.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to add a level of accountability to the regulatory system. The Regulatory Reform and Relief Act will ensure that bureaucrats consider the burdens they impose on American taxpayers and workers, and ultimately the economy. Once bureaucrats are forced to open their eyes to the real world we live in, the regulations they impose will make sense and cost less.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

##### HON. ANDREA H. SEASTRAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 23, I was unavoidably detained due to illness during the votes on rollcall vote No. 158 and rollcall No. 159. Had I been present for these votes, I would have voted "aye" to both.

#### AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAX

##### HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am joined today by several of my colleagues, including Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. JACOBS, in

introducing legislation to add two amendments to the generation-skipping transfer tax [GSTT] law which we believe were unintentionally omitted by Congress at the time the original provisions were enacted. This bill was sponsored in the 103d Congress by Mr. BREWSTER, and I have taken the liberty of including his statement of introduction, with minor changes, to introduce the bill in this Congress.

The amendments concern the predeceased parent exclusion of the GSTT law. The exclusion applies to direct gifts or bequests from a grandparent to a grandchild where the grandchild's parent, the transferor's child, is deceased at the time of the transfer. Where this situation occurs, there is no generation-skipping, since the child is dead; therefore it is not appropriate to add a GST tax on top of ordinary estate or gift taxes, and the predeceased parent exclusion properly excludes such transfers from the GST tax.

Our bill would expand the predeceased parent exclusion to apply to gifts by persons without lineal descendants and to trust gifts.

First, gifts or bequests by a childless individual to collateral descendants would be treated the same as transfers by persons with lineal descendants. Accordingly, the exclusion would be extended to apply to transfers made by a childless individual to his or her grandnieces and grandnephews in the situation where that individual's siblings and nieces and nephews are all deceased at the time of the transfer.

Second, the bill applies the predeceased parent exclusion to transfers made through a trust. Under current law, the predeceased parent exclusion is limited, unintentionally, we believe, to direct gifts and bequests, and does not apply to trust gifts even if the parent of the receiving beneficiary was deceased at all relevant times. In addition to other trusts, this provision particularly affects certain charitable trusts where the charity would have an interest for a period of years before distributing property to the individual beneficiaries. In the situation where the beneficiary's parent is dead, and was dead when the trust was created, there is certainly no generation skipping involved which would justify the levy of an additional tax. It is important to note, that these trusts are significant sources of financial support for many charities, and should not be discouraged, unintentionally, where not necessary for the policy of the underlying tax provisions. The bill would remove this obstacle.

The terminations, distributions, and transfers to which this bill would apply are those occurring on or after January 1, 1995, which would be generation-skipping transfers as defined in section 2611 of the Internal Revenue Code and subject to the GST tax, except for the application of the predeceased parent exclusion as amended by this legislation.

The proposed legislation has substantial support from charities, both large and small, and of all types, for example, social service providers, museums, libraries, hospitals, and universities, from around the country. In September 1993 testimony before the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures of the Ways and Means Committee, the administration indicated they did not oppose the measure. We would welcome other Congressmen as co-sponsors of this legislation.

HONORING JOHN M. STUMBO

## HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a special friend to Prestonsburg, Floyd County, and all of eastern Kentucky, John M. Stumbo. John, who served as judge-executive of Floyd County since 1983, passed away recently at the age of 67.

A World War II veteran in the Army, Judge Stumbo was a leader who was concerned with our young people and worked to achieve a better way of life in eastern Kentucky.

Nicknamed "Lightning," an obvious contrast to his slow-talking, deliberate manner, Judge Stumbo entered Floyd County's political scene in the early 1950's as a member of the county board of education. He held that post for 31 years, serving the last three decades as the board chairman.

After his service as board chairman, he was appointed judge-executive by then-Governor, John Y. Brown in 1983, following the death of Judge Larry Lafferty, Jr. He was reelected in 1985, 1989, and again in 1993.

Weathering many storms during his 44 years in the public eye, Judge Stumbo was a recognized force in eastern Kentucky politics.

As Floyd County's leader, he led the effort to develop a countywide network of fire hydrants, which served as a model for other counties. Also under his leadership, Floyd County became one of the first counties in the State to enact mandatory participation in a solid waste disposal system. And, at the time of his death, a new county jail is under construction and a new courthouse in the planning stages.

He promoted our region's strength, twice heading the Kentucky Coal Council, pushing the natural resources that bless eastern Kentucky.

And, as chairman for the Big Sandy Area Development District for 4 years, he showed his devotion to economic development by playing an instrumental role in building the Big Sandy Regional Airport. Finally, his appointment of a county-financed economic development authority in the late 1980's was unique to eastern Kentucky.

We will miss Judge John M. Stumbo. He committed five decades of his life to public service in Floyd County and eastern Kentucky. His legacy will long be remembered.

## THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF BALLSTON SPA V.F.W.

## HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commemorate the anniversary of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 358. This post, I am proud to say, is based in Ballston Spa, NY of my congressional district, and is celebrating a remarkable 75th year in existence.

The V.F.W., Mr. Speaker, has been an organization of exceptional merit and service to

the needs of many veterans. It is only appropriate that those brave men and women who placed themselves in harms way overseas be represented by such an able organization. The members of Post No. 358 have been receiving just such outstanding service for 75 years now. It is comforting to know that those who served the needs of our country and fought for the principles and ideals of America all over the globe can depend on the support of an organization like Post 358 back home in upstate New York.

Mr. Speaker, the service of Post 358 in Ballston Spa is worthy of significant recognition. This post, and others like it, are the reason I fought so hard to attain Department level status for Veterans' Affairs. When Ronald Reagan signed that legislation into law, veterans were finally afforded the degree of national consideration they deserve. The efforts of V.F.W. Posts like this one, Mr. Speaker, having served the needs of veterans since 1920, assured veterans the assistance and recognition they deserved prior to approval of this Government Department and continue to encourage fair consideration of veterans' issues. For this, Mr. Speaker, we own Post 358 a tremendous debt of gratitude.

## SALUTING THE EFFORTS OF GEORGE CHIMPLES

## HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important event which will take place in my district on Saturday, March 4th. On that day, the Kardamylian Society of New York will honor noted philanthropist and industrialist George Chimples. He will be honored during the society's 60th annual dinner dance that will take place at the Grand Prospect Hall in Brooklyn.

Mr. Speaker, George Chimples is a prominent member and leader of the Greek-American community and is closely involved with the affairs of the Greek Orthodox Church. He serves as an Archon of the ecumenical patriarchate of Constantinople, and for the last 17 years, he has chaired the Finance Committee of the Archdiocese of North and South America. He also serves as the national vice chairman of the United Hellenic American Congress. George is a great friend to the Greek-American community and his kindness and generosity inspires us all.

George Chimples has been granted many awards for his tireless efforts on a variety of needy causes and has been a major benefactor to the establishment of countless churches and educational institutions. I am very impressed with George's achievements on the behalf of others. George Chimples has truly earned recognition for his distinguished philanthropy, and I hope all of my colleagues here will join the Kardamylian Society of New York in congratulating him for his tremendous accomplishments.

## CLEAN WATER LEVEL OF EFFORT GRANTS

### HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today, along with the other Members of the Wisconsin delegation, I am introducing the Level of Effort Clean Water Bonus Fund Act of 1995. This bill would amend the Clean Water Act to set aside 20 percent of the amount provided annually for federal capitalization grants under the State Revolving Loan Fund [SRF] Program and use those funds to provide grants to States that have devoted financial resources to the SRF or other wastewater treatment grant programs beyond the minimum required under the program.

States which have made clean water a top priority and have invested resources toward wastewater treatment beyond what is required under the Clean Water Act naturally have seen significant improvement in their water quality. Unfortunately, since Federal funds are distributed through a formula which is based in large part on needs, these States find that the Federal response to their hard efforts is to reduce their Federal funds. States which have not devoted the resources necessary to make real improvements in their water quality, for lack of effort or other reasons, will receive an increase in Federal funding.

This is an approach which does not make sense to me. Too many of our Federal programs contain disincentives for States to invest their own funds beyond the minimum required. An incentive grant program would recognize the hard budget choices and efforts made by States which overmatch the required SRF contribution and it would encourage other States to invest greater resources in this program in the future. I believe this is a more rational policy than rewarding States which do less by giving them more Federal money.

As Congress begins the Clean Water reauthorization process, I hope that we will take a look at how we spend our Federal dollars and use those dollars to provide incentives to States so that overall spending on clean water will increase, and our water quality will improve as well.

## WELSH-AMERICANS

### HON. PAT DANNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, today is a very special day for our country's Welsh-American population. On March 1 of each year, Welsh-Americans gather to celebrate the great tradition of St. David's Day.

This holiday recognizes the life and legend of St. David, a Welshman who lived in the most holy manner possible. His crowning achievement was when he was canonized by Pope Callistus II in 1120 A.D. as the Patron Saint of Wales.

At the time of his death, it is said his last words were, "Be joyful brothers and sisters. Keep your faith and do the little things you have seen and heard with me." Then, as the story has it, angels carried his soul to heaven.

His guidance has served as a model for people of Welsh descent worldwide for more than 8½ centuries. Here in America, we have been truly graced by the Welsh community, which has produced a long list of outstanding Americans, including Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln.

For our Nation's entire Welsh-American community, I wish them a happy St. David's Day.

## URGING SUPPORT FOR H.R. 1079, THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

### HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday—along with our colleagues, Mr. LIVINGSTON of Louisiana and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas—I introduced H.R. 1079, the Smithsonian Institution Sesquicentennial Commemorative Coin Act. Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. JOHNSON, and I are privileged to serve as members of the Smithsonian's Board of Regents and to be involved in the planning process for the Institution's 150th anniversary celebration, which will take place next year.

Created as a Federal trusteeship by act of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution is today the largest research and museum complex in the world. The various museums of the Smithsonian were visited more than 25 million times last year while thousands more utilized the vast repository of knowledge and artifacts to assist in myriad research and scholarly activities.

As a preeminent national cultural institution, the Smithsonian is charged with preserving and interpreting human culture and the physical and biological worlds through conservation of the national collections that represent our cultural heritage, active presentation of exhibitions and public programs, and scholarship in the arts, science, and history.

#### ESTABLISHMENT AND HISTORY

James Smithson, 1765–1829, a British scientist who never visited the United States, drew up his will in 1826 naming his nephew, Henry James Hungerford, as beneficiary. Smithson stipulated that should the nephew die without heirs—as he did in 1835—the estate would go to the United States to found "at Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

On July 1, 1836, Congress accepted the legacy bequeathed to the Nation by James Smithson and pledged the faith of the United States to the charitable trust. In 1838, following approval of the bequest by the British courts, the United States received Smithson's estate—105 bags of gold sovereigns, then the equivalent of \$515,169. On August 10, 1846, an act of Congress signed by President James K. Polk established the Smithsonian Institution in its present form and provided for the administration of the trust, independent of the Government itself, by a Board of Regents and the Secretary of the Institution. The Board of Regents is comprised of the Vice President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, three Members of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representa-

tives, and nine citizen members appointed by a joint resolution to Congress.

#### SIZE AND SCOPE OF THE SMITHSONIAN COLLECTIONS

From that initial bequest an open-ended mandate of James Smithson, the Smithsonian has grown to include 14 museums, the National Zoological Park, and research facilities located in 8 States and the Republic of Panama.

The total number of objects, works of art, and specimens at the Smithsonian is estimated at 140 million, most of which are in the National Museum of Natural History—about 120 million specimens. Another significant portion of the Institution's collections is the National Postal Museum's philatelic collection which comprises more than 16 million objects.

Many artifacts are donated to the Smithsonian by individuals, private collectors, and Federal agencies; others come to the collections through field expeditions, bequests, exchanges with other museums and organizations, and purchases. More than 480,000 objects and specimens were acquired to 1993.

Artifacts not on display are stored in collection study areas in the museums and are either loaned to other museums or used for research. Air and spacecraft are conserved and stored in the Paul E. Garber Facility in Suitland, MD, about 6 miles from the National Mall. Suitland is also home to the Smithsonian's Museum Support Center which houses research collections and will also be the site of the National Museum of the American Indian's research collections center.

#### THE SESQUICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

The Smithsonian's sesquicentennial commemoration in 1996 provides the opportunity to both celebrate the past great accomplishments of the Institution while also looking to its future role and mission as it prepares for the next millennium. The central goal of the 150th anniversary year commemoration, however, will be to increase the sense of ownership and participation in the Smithsonian by all Americans. The Smithsonian is truly an institution of the people as the Nation's designated steward for the preservation and exhibition of the national collections. The 150th anniversary activities will focus on forging a stronger relationship between the institution and its benefactors and beneficiaries—the American people.

During 1996, the Smithsonian will undertake a series of programs and stage a number of events that will commemorate its founding and explore new ways in which it can serve the public in the future. These activities, while extensions of the existing framework of Smithsonian programs, will require significant financial resources. Recognizing the existing budget constraints under which the Federal Government must operate, the Smithsonian's Board of Regents concluded it would not seek any additional appropriated funds in support of sesquicentennial programming. Rather, turning to the private component of the public-private partnership, the Smithsonian will concentrate its efforts to raise support and funding for the anniversary programming for non-Federal sources.

#### COMMEMORATIVE COINS

One avenue available to the Institution in raising a significant amount of the necessary funds is through the issuance of coins commemorative of the anniversary year. The coins

would be issued on August 10, 1996, exactly 150 years from the actual date of the act of Congress which established the Smithsonian Institution. The issue of Smithsonian sesquicentennial commemorative coins will provide an opportunity for the American public to obtain a valued memento while at the same time supporting the Institution mandated to preserve its cultural and historical patrimony. Just as importantly, the funds derived from the issuance and sale of these commemorative coins would transfer the financial responsibility for sesquicentennial activities from the American taxpayer to voluntary collectors.

Funds raised through the coin sale will enable the Smithsonian to showcase its 150-year service to the Nation and will also, hopefully, help the Institution meet the anticipated budgetary challenges which could threaten the current level of service to the public. It will assist in continuing education programs that reach all strata of our society. In addition, the legislation would authorize that 15 percent of the total proceeds remitted to the Institution would be designated to support the National Numismatic Collection at the National Museum of American History. This component of the legislation is strongly supported by the numismatic community and in a very tangible way demonstrates appreciation for their support of all congressionally authorized commemorative coin programs.

Without exception, we all have constituents who visit, communicate with, and otherwise benefit from the Smithsonian every day. From eager first graders to learned scholars and researchers to out senior citizens, the public is consistently served by the vast resources and expertise of the Smithsonian and its staff. Successful enactment of this legislation will guarantee the American people the benefits and wonder of, as well as continued free access to this multifaceted institution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join with me and with Congressmen LIVINGSTON and JOHNSON in sponsoring this legislation, so important and beneficial to Americans throughout our great country.

IN MEMORY OF RUBY ODESSA  
CAESAR

**HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA**  
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to announce the passing of Mrs. Rubye Odessa Caesar. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a great woman who made significant contributions to the people and communities of the city of Philadelphia.

Mrs. Caesar first moved to the city of Philadelphia in the early 1960's with her husband. The Caesars were active members of the New Central Baptist Church and later the Good News Baptist Church. After her husband's death in 1974, Mrs. Caesar continued her activity at Good News. She received much recognition and many awards for her devotion to her church.

In addition, Mrs. Caesar contributed greatly to her community working as a volunteer with the Headstart Program and working to stop gang activity in North Philadelphia. Mrs. Caesar worked hard to improve her community

and was especially proud of the establishment of the Lower Tioga Community Council Emergency Food Referral and Kitchen Cupboard, one of her greatest accomplishments, which will live on into the future.

Mrs. Caesar provided for and nurtured many young people in Philadelphia as a crossing guard and as a foster parent. She also served as the judge of elections for the 43d ward, 10th division and helped organize many voter registration drives. Mrs. Caesar always responded to calls for help from many political leaders and candidates.

Although she suffered from many illnesses, Mrs. Caesar maintained a positive spirit and believed that more work could always be done to improve the community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our most sincere condolences to her brother Mr. Joseph Battle, Sr., her sisters Mrs. Lois Wyatt and Mrs. Doris Elizabeth Eaddy, her sisters-in-law, her children, Mr. Eddie Reni Battle, Ms. Serita Caesar, Ms. Jeanette Mash-Battle, Mrs. Tanya Irene Stewart Caesar and Mrs. Arlene Daniels Caesar. Mrs. Caesar is also survived by her companion of many years, Mr. Eldridge Robbins, and many grandchildren and other family members. Mrs. Caesar will be greatly missed by all who knew and loved her.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCIS-  
SIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT  
OF DEFENSE FOR FISCAL YEAR  
1995

SPEECH OF

**HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 22, 1995*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes:

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly oppose this bill to punish the American people for the management errors of Congress and the Pentagon. Of course we need to fund military readiness, and of course we have to pay for our peacekeeping operations. But it is not acceptable to do this by stealing money from environmental cleanup, defense conversion, job training, and school funding for our kids. We are punishing the children and punishing our communities because Congress can't find enough money in the \$260 billion defense budget to pay for readiness.

I oppose cutting these programs because they are not the reason we might be short on readiness funding. Let me tell you what has really been damaging readiness:

The Trident D-5 nuclear missile, a \$5 billion cold war relic, designed to hit targets which no longer exist in the former Soviet Union.

The Star Wars Program—a Reagan dream which hasn't given us a single concrete result after \$36 billion worth of wasteful spending since 1984—more than the entire annual budget for the Department of Education.

And, Mr. Chairman, if you truly want to be intelligent about paying for readiness and peacekeeping, you should do it by cutting the inflated intelligence budget.

We wouldn't have a readiness problem if Congress and the Pentagon could just stop wasting billions of taxpayer dollars on these cold war relics. These are the programs we should be targeting to offset this supplemental appropriations bill.

Instead, H.R. 889 attacks programs that are essential to the future of our children and the health of our economy. I am truly ashamed that despite the end of the cold war, and despite the fiscal crisis facing our public school system, we are now considering a bill which takes money away from the \$30 billion Department of Education budget and puts it into the \$260 billion military budget. We're finally beginning to see the fine print in the contract on America.

Not only does this bill propose to cut important domestic programs to make up for military waste, it cuts important programs within the defense budget as well—programs that are vital to the economic future of California and the rest of the Nation.

I am not the only Californian who feels this way. Allow me to read a quote about H.R. 889's cuts in environmental cleanup funding from California's Republican Governor:

The continued erosion of cleanup funding inevitably will threaten the health of armed services personnel and civilians who work at military bases where contamination is present. It will also exacerbate economic suffering in communities that are struggling to redevelop closing bases.

The cleanup of military bases is not a partisan issue, Mr. Chairman. It should be recognized as an essential ingredient in the economic recovery of California and the rest of the Nation, and it should not be cut.

Another essential ingredient is the technology reinvestment program, the cornerstone of President Clinton's landmark defense conversion initiative. In two short years, this program has moved California's economy forward by helping defense firms produce goods and services that can be used in the civilian sector. Despite the TRP's importance for California's economy, and indeed America's economy, H.R. 889 slashes funding for this as well.

This bill, along with the National Security Revitalization Act which was passed last week, is sending the military budget back to the Dark Ages by preserving cold war relics and cutting the programs that are vital to our economic future. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 889, and to fund readiness and peacekeeping by cutting the truly wasteful military programs.

TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND "RED"  
FULARCZYK

**HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to pay tribute to my long-time friend, Raymond "Red" Fularczyk.

Red and I have a lot in common. We were both born in Milwaukee and attended Don Bosco High School, on the city's south side.

Over the years, we have shared a commitment to the working men and women of Wisconsin and our Nation. For example, Red joined the Teamsters at the tender age of 16, and became a union steward just a few short years later. In 1968, he joined the staff of Teamsters Local 200. Throughout the years, Red served as the local's president and secretary-treasurer. He was the principal officer of Joint Council No. 39 until 1990, when he joined the staff of the Central Conference and became director of the Food, Dairy and Warehouse Division and secretary-treasurer.

Red's desire to further serve the American worker manifested itself in his political activities. An ardent supporter of workers' rights, he has always backed candidates on the municipal, county, State, and national levels who shared his views. A true bipartisan, Red was appointed by Wisconsin's Governor to represent labor on the State's Jobs Council Committee.

In continuing his service to the citizens of the Milwaukee area, Red was on the board of directors of both the Milwaukee War Memorial and the Performing Arts Center.

I am pleased to add to the many tributes and commendations Red has received and will continue to receive throughout his retirement.

Congratulations on a job well done. Best wishes as you spend more time with your family and many friends.

#### CRIME LEGISLATION

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, March 1, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### CRIME LEGISLATION IN THE 104TH CONGRESS

Crime ranks as the biggest perceived problem in the country. Although overall crime rates have decreased, most Americans still believe crime should be a priority of the federal government. While law enforcement, courts, and prisons are dealt with primarily by state and local governments, Congress has taken a number of steps in recent months to assist in these efforts.

Last fall, Congress passed anticrime legislation that authorized \$30.2 billion in assistance over the next six years, with 75% of the funds for law enforcement and prisons, and 25% for local crime prevention efforts such as drug education programs or domestic violence shelters. The centerpiece of this law is the program to put thousands of new police officers on the streets. Ninth District sheriffs and police chiefs recently received some \$2.5 million for 44 additional police officers. More assistance will be available in coming months. Indiana is also eligible for funds to increase prison capacity and establish military-style youth boot camps.

The House recently considered a series of six additional crime-related bills, which were based on proposals in the House leadership's "Contract with America".

#### VICTIM RESTITUTION ACT

This bill would require those convicted of a federal crime to pay damages to their victims. Current law permits such restitution, but does not require it. Compliance with court-ordered payments would be a condition of probation, parole, or release. This bill passed with my support.

#### CRIMINAL ALIEN DEPORTATION ACT

This bill would reimburse state and local costs for incarcerating illegal immigrants who have committed crimes. It also would make it easier for the government to deport criminal aliens to their country of origin. With my support, the House passed this bill by a large margin.

#### EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT

Many Hoosiers believe that excessive, drawn-out appeals have made the death penalty ineffective as a deterrent to crime. The reforms in this bill would place a one-year limit for death row inmates to file federal appeals of state sentences. However, the bill does not go far enough to ensure that competent lawyers are appointed to argue death penalty cases. A large percentage of appeals result from mistakes made by inexperienced lawyers. Serious death penalty reform must deal with this problem. I supported this bill, but hope the Senate will pass more comprehensive reforms.

#### EXCLUSIONARY RULE REFORM ACT

The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution protects citizens against "unreasonable searches and seizures". In general, evidence obtained in violation of these procedures is excluded from trial unless 1) police officers had a search warrant and 2) believed they were acting in "good faith" compliance with the Fourth Amendment. The bill would create a broad loophole in the Fourth Amendment by permitting virtually all evidence obtained without a search warrant. Constitutional safeguards are not always popular with a public fed up with criminals going free on technicalities, but there have been many recent cases in which law enforcement agencies have violated civil rights in unreasonable searches. I have serious concerns about the implications of this bill on individual liberty, and did not support the bill.

#### PRISON FUNDING

Like last year's legislation, this bill encourages states to adopt measures to increase the average time served in prison. Half of the grants would be reserved for states that enacted "truth-in-sentencing" laws. I support such laws. However, this bill would eliminate funding for drug courts and change the grant formula to reduce Indiana's share of federal money. It also runs counter to the spirit of the unfunded mandates bills passed earlier this year, by requiring states to rewrite their criminals laws before receiving federal support. This bill would reduce Indiana's funding, and I did not support it.

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS

This bill would eliminate the current community policing program and replace it with a \$10 billion block grant program for a variety of law enforcement purposes. Funds would be allocated on a formula based on the average number of violent crimes in a local jurisdiction.

I did not support this bill for two main reasons. First, law enforcement block grants have a long history of abuse. Under a similar program in the 1970s, local governments spent funds on yachts, airplanes, military tanks, and other frivolous uses. It was repealed in 1982. Such abuse is expensive to prevent. This bill includes \$300 million—about 3% of the total funds—for the Justice Department to police local governments for abuse. Second, the community policing program has been very successful, and one-half of the money is designated for small communities and rural areas. It should not be eliminated. The block grant formula in this bill would provide less funding for Indiana's counties and rural communities. I believe more police officers on the beat, along with keeping criminals in prison, is a most effective way to fight crime. The administrative

cost of the police grant program is just 0.08% of the total fund—which means less money in Washington and more money in local communities.

#### CONCLUSION

The House-passed proposal deserve a mixed review. The provisions for victim restitution, alien deportation, and death penalty reforms are long-needed, and they received my strong support. I am hopeful the Senate will take quick action. However, I am concerned about the exclusionary rule bill, which encroaches on important Constitutional protections against government intrusion. The funding provisions for prisons and block grants would hurt the Ninth District and Indiana, and block grants only increase the likelihood of fraud and abuse.

I have some doubts whether crime can be fought effectively with federal legislation. The primary responsibility for fighting crime belongs to state and local governments, and previous efforts from Washington have not generally been considered effective. But the public demand for action against crime is understandable, and Washington should do its part to help local and state officials reduce the threat of violent crime.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE AMT DEPRECIATION RELIEF ACT OF 1995

### HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide much-needed relief to American companies who currently are being penalized for investing in new plant and equipment.

Under the 1986 Tax Reform Act, Congress established an alternative minimum tax system for corporations. The purpose of the AMT was to prevent profitable corporations from escaping Federal income tax liability by making excessive use of tax preferences.

Unfortunately, the AMT has turned out to have a very different impact than was intended. Instead of ensuring that profitable companies do not escape Federal taxation, the AMT has worked, in many cases, as a trap, especially for capital intensive manufacturing companies.

The problems with the AMT arise principally because of depreciation differences. Under the regular tax system, companies are permitted to depreciate investments in plant and equipment under an accelerated system designed to encourage investment.

Regular tax depreciation schedules are structured to encourage companies to invest in new equipment and to enhance productivity. The effect is to help keep U.S. companies competitive by providing accelerated recovery of costs.

Under the AMT, however, we turn around and take away the tax incentives we have offered to encourage investment under the regular tax. The effect is that through the regular tax, we tell U.S. companies that we want them to invest in productivity-enhancing plant and equipment. Then, under the AMT, we tell them that if they act according to those incentives, and according to the dictates of their own competitive position, we will punish them. It makes no sense, and we should change the law.

The legislation I am introducing today will eliminate depreciation as a preference under the alternative minimum tax. That is, in determining AMT tax liability, for both recovery periods and methods of calculating depreciation, companies will compute depreciation as they currently do under the regular tax.

Removing the separate AMT calculation of depreciation will eliminate a significant source of complexity in the Tax Code. No longer will companies be forced to conduct two separate sets of depreciation computations. No longer will companies be penalized for implementing investment strategies warranted by their own economic circumstances because of concerns related to the AMT.

Largely because of the AMT, U.S. companies currently enjoy less favorable cost recovery provisions than their foreign competitors. By eliminating depreciation as an AMT preference, we can remove the disadvantage American companies face.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting fairness, simplicity, and sensible tax policy by cosponsoring the AMT Depreciation Relief Act of 1995.

---

**PUBLIC BROADCASTING SERVES  
THE PEOPLE**

**HON. TOM BEVILL**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I favor reducing the Federal Government and I know that many popular Federal programs have been cut and will be cut more to achieve this worthy purpose.

But, I am very concerned that we could go too far. Some people say we should kill all Federal funding for public broadcasting. I think this is going too far.

Public television and radio stations have provided essential services to our Nation for many, many years. Many rural areas depend on public broadcasting to get the news and in-depth reporting on national and world issues.

The children's programming is highly educational, emphasizes strong family values and has the additional benefit of being commercial-free. I know parents and children appreciate that.

Public broadcasting serves as the benchmark for good taste and quality programming throughout the broadcasting world. I urge my colleagues not to throw this all away under the guise of deficit reduction.

I want to reduce the role of government in our lives and I want to balance the budget. I agree that these are goals that cannot be met without making hard budget choices.

But, I believe it would be a false savings to eliminate all Federal funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, especially when this funding helps generate millions in private donations.

The private sector, which already contributes generously, certainly cannot be expected to do more.

I urge my colleagues to use some common sense in making our choices for cuts. Let's be careful we don't go overboard and kill programs which represent the best that America has to offer.

**REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE  
RONALD V. DELLUMS IN SUP-  
PORT OF THE DAVIS BACON ACT**

**HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to respond to a February 5, 1995, Washington Post column by George Will, which calls for the repeal of the Davis-Bacon act, because it supposedly discriminates against minorities and women seeking employment in the construction industry.

Mr. Will's contentions about the history and application of the Davis-Bacon Act as racist are totally wrong. His column is clearly based on a thoroughly discredited so-called study by the extreme right wing CATO Institute, that contends that Davis-Bacon is a Jim Crow law enacted to exclude black workers from Federal construction projects—and that its repeal will improve the economic opportunities of minorities.

Both of Mr. Will's contentions are utterly without merit.

Mr. Will's column calls for the repeal of a law which protects the wages of all construction workers, including minorities and women. The Will column attempts to justify repeal of Davis-Bacon by asserting that reducing the wages of minority and female workers is somehow in their interests. The column proceeds to claim that the costs of Davis-Bacon hurt inner cities the most because they prohibit contractors from employing local workers who still need to learn job skills.

The truth is that minority and female workers have entered the construction industry in increasing numbers over the past 15 years. Because they are often the newest members of the industry, they are particularly vulnerable to wage cutting practices the Davis-Bacon Act is designed to prohibit. Norman Hill, president of the A. Philip Randolph Institute, has characterized women and minority workers as "particularly vulnerable to exploitation such as the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931 is designed to prohibit."

Congressman Bacon and Senator Davis were both Republican's. It was signed into law by Herbert Hoover—not widely known as a friend of unions. The law guarantees that all workers on a construction project paid for by the Federal Government get the same money for doing the same work. Because of this crucial labor protection, a Government construction contractor can't pay some workers less than others for doing the same job.

This member opposes the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act, which I would remind Mr. Will is exactly the same position as his hero, President Ronald Reagan.

---

**TRIBUTE TO MABEL GERTRUDE  
HOLMES**

**HON. DONALD M. PAYNE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my col-

leagues a tribute that was paid to one of America's great educators, the late Ms. Mabel Gertrude Holmes. On Friday, the city of Elizabeth, NJ, recognized the achievements of Ms. Holmes. Born in Virginia, Ms. Holmes first moved to Elizabeth in 1906. During an era when most African-Americans were denied opportunity, she earned a B.S. in elementary education from the Newark Normal School in 1921 and went on to receive an M.S. in education from New York University. Ms. Holmes put her education to great use, she taught second graders at Continental School No. 3 for 28 years. Elizabeth is fortunate to have had this dedicated educator and concerned citizen as one of its leading residents for so many years.

In 1949, Ms. Holmes became the first African-American to serve as the principal of a school in the city of Elizabeth. She served in an exemplary manner in that position for 14 years. Ms. Holmes also served as a member of the Elizabeth Board of Education from 1966–69. In Elizabeth, the name Mabel Gertrude Holmes will always be synonymous with education. She served her community well and for a very long period of time. Many lives were touched and improved by this kind and compassionate woman from Smedley, VA.

Mabel G. Holmes is an excellent role model for our young people and it is appropriate that she is being remembered during Black History Month. An educator and humanitarian, her life of service to her community is an inspiration to us all. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in recognition of a truly special woman, the late Mabel Gertrude Holmes.

---

**SALUTE TO MRS. VIRGINIA  
RUFFIN**

**HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute Mrs. Virginia Lavenia Taylor Ruffin whose 100th birthday will be celebrated on March 5 at the "Neighbor's Place" in Philadelphia, PA. Born on March 5, 1895, Mrs. Ruffin, a resident of North Philadelphia, has contributed a great deal to her church and community throughout her lifetime.

Mrs. Ruffin has been an active member of the Haven Methodist Church for more than 50 years as a nurse's aide and a bright star member. In addition, she has been very active in her community. As a block captain in her North Philadelphia neighborhood, Mrs. Ruffin sponsored bus trips and picnics for children and organized neighborhood cleanups. While she is troubled by the dangers of today's society, Mrs. Ruffin has high hopes for the future of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Ms. Ruth Birchett, the Heritage Community Economic Development Corp., and the friends of Mrs. Ruffin in wishing her a very happy 100th birthday.



## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. XAVIER BECERRA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to explain my absence from the House on Friday, February 24 and Monday, February 27, 1995.

As I have stated previously, my wife and I are faced with a trying family medical situation which has required my presence at home in Los Angeles as often as possible and, unfortunately, at times when the House is in session. We are expecting our second child this May, and under doctor's orders, my wife has been limited to bed rest until she has completed her pregnancy.

Regretfully, I missed a number of recorded floor votes during this brief absence from Washington. For the record, I would like to indicate my position on each amendment and bill:

Tate amendment to H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995 (rollcall 167)—“No.”

Wise amendment to H.R. 450 (rollcall 168)—“Aye.”

Green amendment to H.R. 450 (rollcall 169)—“Aye.”

Waxman amendment to H.R. 450 (rollcall 170)—“Aye.”

Fattah amendment to H.R. 450 (rollcall 171)—“Aye.”

Volkmer amendment to H.R. 450 (rollcall 172)—“Aye.”

On motion to recommit with instructions (rollcall 173)—“Aye.”

On final passage of H.R. 450 (rollcall 174)—“No.”

On agreeing to the resolution (rollcall 175)—“No.”

Brown (CA) substitute to H.R. 1022, Risk Assessment and Cost-Benefit Act (rollcall 176)—“Aye.”

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND  
URBAN DEVELOPMENT ELIMI-  
NATION ACT OF 1995

**HON. JOEL HEFLEY**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, French economist Jean-Baptiste Say is famous as the author of Say's Law, sometimes summarized as “Supply creates its own demand.” In economic circles, this law is still the subject of debate.

Here in Washington, however, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has been proving Say's Law for the past 30 years. We keep increasing spending on public housing, and the problem just gets worse.

Contrary to popular belief, housing assistance was not cut during the Reagan years. Discretionary Federal assisted housing outlays have grown from \$165 million in 1962 to \$5.5 billion in 1980 and \$23.7 billion in 1994, resulting in 55 percent more families being assisted today than in 1980.

Has this dramatic growth solved the problem? No. Today, after HUD's budget has

grown by over 400 percent in 15 years, only 30 percent of the families eligible to receive housing assistance are doing so.

And what kind of housing are they receiving? The 1992 report on severely distressed public housing found many public housing residents afraid to leave their own homes due to prevalent crime while others were living in decaying conditions that threatened their safety and health.

Three decades of HUD and homeownership is down, homelessness is up, and millions of low-income Americans are condemned to live in substandard housing which would be unacceptable if it were owned by anyone else.

Quite simply, HUD has failed its mission of providing decent, low-income housing to America's poor. On the other hand, it has done an excellent job of providing jobs to over four thousand Washington bureaucrats who oversee the hundred of programs within the Department.

For these reasons, today I am introducing legislation to abolish HUD by January 1, 1998 and consolidate its existing programs into block grants and vouchers.

If it is truly the job of government to subsidize low-income housing, then let's do it without the middle-man. Rent vouchers allow low-income people to choose their own home, rather than have some bureaucrat choose it for them. Block grants give money directly to the States and local governments—that much closer to the taxpayers who pay the bills.

It is time to admit that Uncle Sam makes a lousy landlord and end this 30-year experiment in socialist domestic policy. As Bill Clinton said in his State of the Union Address, “The old way of governing around here actually seemed to reward failure.”

Let's stop rewarding HUD's failure by abolishing HUD and eliminating the unnecessary bureaucracy. The alternative is to continue investing in instant ghettos and Federal bureaucrats. That's a solution we've tried for 30 years, and it just hasn't worked.

CONGRATULATIONS STANLEY E.  
GREATHOUSE ON 31 YEARS OF  
SERVICE TO THE WAYNE-WHITE  
COUNTIES ELECTRIC COOPERA-  
TIVE

**HON. GLENN POSHARD**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Stanley E. Greathouse on 31 years of dedicated service to the Wayne-White Counties Electric Cooperative. On March 12, 1995 friends and family will gather at Orchardville School in Wayne County, IL to honor Stanley for his years of service and wish him a wonderful retirement.

Born December 11, 1916 Stanley has dedicated his life to serving his neighbors. Growing up Stanley attended a one-room school in Orchardville, rode a horse to high school, and worked on a farm to pay his way through Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. After graduating from Southern, Stanley returned to that one-room school where he taught for 4 years and later became its principal, all the while cultivating grain and tending livestock on his farm. In addition to his work as an educator and farmer Stanley has served

the spiritual needs of his community. He has served as pastor to the Polar Creek Branch of Reorganized Church of Latter Day Saints and has served as president of its board of directors.

Stanley's career with the Wayne-White Counties Electric Cooperative began in 1964 when he became a member of its board of directors. Since that day Stanley has set the standard of excellence in helping to improve the lives of local residents. Through his positions on numerous boards Stanley has worked diligently for the development of rural electrification, a fight that I am sure he will continue long into retirement. Stanley's three decades of official service to the rural electrification effort will be hard to duplicate.

Stanley Greathouse has served his community in countless ways. Whether as an educator, spiritual leader, farmer, or advocate for rural electric initiatives he has always championed the needs of rural communities. The people who know him understand that he simply strives to make life better for his neighbors.

I am proud to join with the hundreds of well wishers, friends, and family members who are gathered to wish Stanley a splendid retirement from the Wayne-White Counties Electric Cooperative. I am honored to represent this distinguished gentleman in Congress. His is an example for all to admire.

TRIBUTE TO NEWTON CATTELL ON  
HIS RETIREMENT

**HON. JOHN T. MYERS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in the popular press, the term “lobbyist” connotes both good and bad. The typical lobbyist is said to represent special interests who are at odds with the will of the American people. And indeed, there are some like that. On the other hand, real lobbyists include our constituents, interested citizens, and persons who represent commercial and nonprofit institutions whose knowledge and insight enables us to legislate wisely.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to recognize one of those real lobbyists, Newton Cattell, who will retire at the end of this month. My colleagues deserve to know of his valuable contributions both to our Nation's institutions of higher learning and to the Congress. When Newton retires, we will miss him dearly for he has represented universities to this Congress longer than any other individual.

I have known Newton since 1983 when some of our great midwestern universities formed the Midwestern Universities Alliance, a consortium of public land-grant universities. Newton has been its director from its inception and has kept midwestern Members of Congress informed about the state of higher education in their region and the needs of the institutions, their students, and faculties.

Newton's lobbying activities on behalf of colleges and universities go back to 1968 shortly after passage of the 1965 Higher Education Act. It was then that Penn State, where he worked at the time, asked him to seek funding for the new legislation. To that end, Newton



regularly visited with the Pennsylvania Members and their staffs. Among others, our colleagues JOE MCDADE and BOB WALKER still remember Newton's entreaties.

In 1978, Newton accepted the position of executive director for Federal relations at the Association of American Universities. His expertise in research and graduate education served him well in this job and in representing some of America's great research universities.

It was the Midwestern Universities Alliance that gave Newton his greatest challenge. In addition to Indiana and Purdue, which are my State universities, the members of the alliance include Minnesota, Wisconsin, Ohio State, Missouri, Iowa State, and Nebraska. Under Newton's direction, the future of these midwestern universities has been enhanced and a common legislative agenda developed.

Newton is a good friend. A good husband to Maddy, a good father to four children and an incredible grandfather to nine grandchildren. He's a solid citizen and a solid sailor. In his retirement, he'll do it right, not casting about but smoothly sailing into new waters with that ever present on course attitude and a steady hand on the wheel. And first mate Maddy, who served as his executive assistant for the last 10 years, will trim the sails. May they always have following winds and a pleasant sea and come back to warm friends and good family.

Congratulations, Newton, you've earned it.

#### THE MANY GIFTS OF MILTON TOBIAN

#### HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for most of his life, Milton Tobian has devoted himself to others—to his country, to his family, to his faith, to combatting discrimination, to overcoming poverty and injustice, to fostering good government and progressive education, to the elderly, to those suffering the ravages of AIDS or the cruelty of Parkinson's disease, to less fortunate human beings.

On Saturday, March 4, 1995, at a benefit celebration for the Trinity Ministry to the Poor in Dallas, TX, "The Many Gifts of Milton Tobian" will be recognized and honored.

Rarely has an event been so well named.

No one who knows Milton Tobian—and I am privileged to have counted him among my friends for a quarter of a century—can think of him without first thinking of his selflessness.

We can think of his gifts to his community and his fellow beings, because those loving gifts have been his avocation.

The dictionary should have a picture of Milton Tobian beside its definition of humanitarian.

Perhaps Milton Tobian's devotion to worthy causes is a product of his background. His grandparents fled oppression in Russia and found freedom in Texas.

As a graduate of Rice University at 19, Milton immediately entered Navy Midshipmen's School and became the youngest World War II naval officer in the South Pacific when he was assigned to the U.S.S. *Lewis Hancock*.

In spite of his gallant service to his country in wartime, Milton Tobian has preferred the wars he waged right here at home.

In his war for the kind of education he knew should be available to every child, he helped found the League for Educational Advancement in Dallas. The victories he won included desegregation of the Dallas School Board, the establishment of kindergartens, and the School Lunch Program for impoverished children.

In his war against prejudice and discrimination as the longest tenured member of the Texas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and a driving force behind the Texas Conference of Churches' commission on Christian-Jewish relations, he helped win critical battles for civil rights and cooperation among long-divided racial and religious groups.

In his war for good government, Milton Tobian agreed to leave his successful business to establish the first statewide organization of Common Cause, the public interest watchdog group. From cramped headquarters with few resources, Milton Tobian was instrumental in remarkable victories—Texas' first open meetings and open records laws, campaign finance and lobbying reform, utilities regulation, and the toughest consumer protection law in the Nation. His efforts helped make Texas the model for Common Cause organizations and their legislative agendas nationwide.

For a decade, until his retirement in 1987, Milton Tobian's crusade was as southwest regional director of the American Jewish Committee.

But Milton Tobian's wars for causes good and noble continue unabated. In retirement, he has battled for senior citizens, children with AIDS, sufferers of Parkinson's disease, the homeless, the poor.

Milton Tobian has more energy, more talent, and more compassion than public spirited citizens half his 72 years of age.

Generations of Americans, Texans, and Dallasites have benefited from the high standards, the tireless efforts, and the downright goodness of Milton Tobian. Never seeking personal recognition or applause for his good works, he has earned and deserves nothing less than our sincere thanks for "the many gifts of Milton Tobian."

#### TRIBUTE TO BEVERLY A. GUIDRY

#### HON. JAY KIM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my friends at the College of Osteopathic Medicine of the Pacific, the African-American Student National Medical Association and the Chicano-Latino Medical Student Association who will be gathering to honor Ms. Beverly A. Guidry on March 25, 1995.

As assistant dean for student affairs, financial aid and admissions at the College of Osteopathic Medicine of the Pacific in Pomona, CA, as well as in her other professional and civic roles, Ms. Guidry has served men, women, and children of color with distinction and resolve.

Among Ms. Guidry's past endeavors, she has worked as community relations director for the city of Pomona, CA; executive liaison for an international consortium of African and Afri-

can-American business developers; job developer for Operation Second Chance, a community job-placement service for the needy; and as publisher of the Inland Empire Minority Business and Professional Directory.

In addition to her current responsibilities as assistant dean at COMP and advisor to both the African-American Student National Medical Association and the Chicano-Latino Medical Student Association, Ms. Guidry has been given national prominence and recognition as Chair of the National Nomination Committee of the National Association of Medical Minority Educators and the Student Affairs Officers Section of the American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine.

Ms. Guidry's record of community service includes leadership positions with the Pomona Valley NAACP, the Pomona Fair Housing Council, and the Pomona/Los Angeles Urban League. In 1994 she was honored as a West End YWCA Woman of Achievement.

Throughout her career, Ms. Guidry has served as an example and inspiration to us all by providing and creating opportunity for those traditionally underrepresented in civic, educational and professional walks of life. It is my privilege and distinct pleasure to join with her friends and colleagues who will honor her on March 25 for such noble dedication.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO JESUS CHAMORRO FOR 22 EXCELLENT YEARS OF GREAT TALK RADIO

#### HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in my home district of Guam, we have many fine radio personalities and journalists. However, we are blessed with Jesús Chamorro, the only talk show host using our indigenous language, the Chamorro language. His real name is Jesús Charfauros, but for reasons which will be clear as you read this tribute, we have changed his name.

While experts warn that the world's 6,000 languages are dying off, people like 'Sus work to preserve the Chamorro language here on Guam. A graduate of our local University of Guam with a degree in public administration, he began his entertainment career emceeing Chamorro talent shows in niteclubs. Then he started the "Chamorro Hour and Chamorro News," in 1972.

To be sure, some credit must be given to one of the island's communications corporations, namely KUAM, for keeping "The Jesús Chamorro Show" on the airwaves for the last 22 years. Of course, many in the corporate community deserve praise, because he continues to have loyal sponsors. These patrons know 'Sus Chamorro has a large number of faithful listeners. This diligent audience joins 'Sus every weekday morning at 8 a.m. and is considered the "grassroots" of our island community. The 'Sus Chamorro Show is more like an electronic village meeting and the listeners include our most treasured assets, our elders.

The mornings are very alive with 'Sus at the phone. This is morning talk radio at its finest. For 2 hours beginning at 8 a.m., 'Sus engages, encourages, stimulates, and informs. 'Sus Chamorro is one of the most well known

voices throughout all segments of Guam's varied communities. He has been concerned with island issues for many years now, and Guam is enhanced by his show and his concern.

A recipient of the Guam Excellence in Media Award in 1990, 1991, and 1992 and honored with the Governor's Award for "Preservation of Culture," Jesús Chamorro has become a fixture on Guam. Couple his listening audience with his four accomplished children and his ten grandchildren, and surely the values and wisdom of 'Sus Chamorro will be passed on from this generation into the future.

Yes, we the Chamorro speaking radio listeners on Guam are fortunate indeed. With small languages like Chamorro, the world is a more interesting, more beautiful place.

While, according to the experts, many of the small languages are on the verge of dying out, on Guam we still have faith. We teach the Chamorro language to our children in our schools. We speak Chamorro in our homes. We are proud of our Chamorro language and culture.

Our hope is imbedded in the career of people like Jesús Chamorro. The naysayers continue to predict extinction, but we continue to enjoy him, and we wish for many years to come.

Si Yu'os Ma'ase, Jesús.

SPEECH BY WILLIAM B. GOULD IV

**HON. ANNA G. ESHOO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by William B. Gould IV, who is Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, the Charles A. Beardsley Professor of Law at Stanford University, and one of my most outstanding constituents. His remarks before the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States are a fascinating discourse on the significance of President Lincoln's views on labor law and their relationship to the service of African-Americans in the U.S. military during the Civil War. The impressive historical scholarship in this speech is greatly enhanced by Chairman Gould's effective use of passages from the diary of his great grandfather, William B. Gould, who served for over 3 years in the U.S. Navy during the conflict. I urge my colleagues to put Chairman Gould's speech on their reading lists.

LINCOLN, LABOR, AND THE BLACK MILITARY:  
THE LEGACY PROVIDED

(Delivered by William B. Gould IV, February 11, 1995)

"I heard the glad tidings that the Stars and Stripes have been planted over the Capitol of the Confederacy by the invincible Grant. While we honor the living soldiers who have done so much we must not forget to whisper for fear of disturbing the glorious sleep of the men who have fallen. Martyrs to the cause of Right and Equality."—Diary of William B. Gould, April 15, 1865.

These are the words of my great-grandfather written 130 years ago at the time of Appomattox. They reflect the thoughts and passion of one of our country's black naval veterans of the Civil War and his commitment to the military initiatives waged by President Lincoln.

It is meet and right that we come here this evening to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth President of the United States, properly known throughout the world as the Great Emancipator. The New World's central political and social achievement, the Emancipation Proclamation which President Lincoln authored, transcends the ages and future generations. And his ideas about democracy and the rights of all people constitute the central vision of the American democratic system today.

As the sons of Union officers who fought in the Civil War, you know better than most that this 186th anniversary of Lincoln's birthday marks anew the ongoing struggle to free our country from the legacy of the odious institution of slavery so that all people may live out their lives and fulfill their aspirations without the actuality or fear of arbitrary limitation.

One of my law professors used to say that the "greatest constitutional decision ever rendered occurred when Pickett's charge failed at Gettysburg." The legacy of Appomattox and all that led to it resonates throughout our society to this evening here in Washington as part of the unceasing struggle against all arbitrary barriers which afflict mankind.

And both Gettysburg and Appomattox produced the great Civil War amendments to the Constitution, which reversed the infamous *Dred Scott* decision in which the Supreme Court declared blacks to be property constitutionally. The amendments, in turn, have provided our country with the historical framework for both the Supreme Court's great *Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954 ruling condemning separate but equal as a denial of equal protection and also the modern civil rights movement as well as the legislation that it produced. Similarly, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, our most comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation relating to the workplace, is a lineal descendant of the previous century's developments.

I am not a Lincoln or Civil War scholar. Indeed, I find the amount of literature about both subjects to be daunting—and, accordingly, I know that you do not expect a scholarly examination of President Lincoln from me. But there are matters which have and do involve me both practically and professionally with Lincoln and his times.

The first is that I am the fourteenth Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board and, as such, administer an agency and interpret a statute which both seek to implement some of Lincoln's most basic views on labor.

The second is that I am the great-grandson of the first William Benjamin Gould who, along with seven other "contraband" (seized property—the appellation which General Benjamin Butler gave to escaped slaves) set sail in a small boat from Cape Fear, North Carolina and boarded the *USS Cambridge* on September 22, 1862, the day that President Lincoln announced his intent to issue the Emancipation Proclamation. You will know that the Proclamation states in relevant part:

"And I further declare and make known, that such persons of suitable condition [the freed slaves held by those in rebellion], will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service."

And thus it was that William B. Gould joined the United States Navy and served as landsman and steward on the North Atlantic Blockade and subsequently served on vessels visiting Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal and Spain, chasing the Confederate ships which were built by their undercover allies.

In 1864 the American Minister Charles Francis Adams had notified the British government that if the *Alabama* and the *Georgia*—two iron clad "rams" built by the British for the Confederacy—were allowed to go to sea, this would be construed by the United States as a declaration of war. William B. Gould sailed with the steam frigate *Niagara* for the European station to join other vessels such as the *Kearsarge* to keep, in my great-grandfather's words, a "sharp lookout" for these vessels. The *Niagara's* destination was the Bay of Biscay where she eventually engaged in battle.

William B. Gould's service ended on September 29, 1865 when he made the following entry in his diary:

"At the Navy Yard [Charlestown, Massachusetts] at five O'clock I received my Discharge being three years and nine days in the service of Uncle Samuel and glad am I to receive it . . . [pay] of four hundred and twenty four dollars. So end my service in the Navy of the United States of America."

I did not know the first William B. Gould for he died—in Dedham, Massachusetts where he resided from 1871 onward—thirteen years before my birth. I did not know my grandfather, William B. Gould, Jr., a Spanish-American War veteran, for he was to die nine years later in 1932. But the third William B. Gould was my greatest inspiration in my most formative years—and my belief is that the values and culture which he attempted to transmit to me were very much a part of the lives of the first two gentlemen to whom I have referred.

Truly then, President Lincoln's views and policies have had a major impact upon my own life.

As Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, I have a responsibility to implement a statute which promotes the right of employees to band together for the purpose of protecting or improving their own working conditions, to join unions, to engage in collective bargaining and to be free from various forms of discrimination. This statute, enacted as part of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal in 1935, is one of the country's proudest achievements, expressing the policy that the protection of "the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection" should be encouraged.

In recent years, a number of scholars and critics, like myself, took note of the fact that the statute has not been working well in implementing these objectives because of poor administrative processes and ineffective remedies. Some of these matters can be and are being cured by us at the Board and some can be only addressed by Congress. I hope to do what I can to make continued progress in the former category before I depart from Washington and return to California a few years down the road when my term ends.

I enthusiastically support the views contained in the preamble and have made my position known in books, articles, and speeches. In many respects, the fundamentally similar views of President Lincoln were a precursor of our own 1935 legislation.

Recall what Lincoln said to the New York Workingmen's Democratic Republican Association on March 21, 1864:

"The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations, and tongues and kindreds."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Footnotes are at end of speech.

As the Presidential campaign of 1860 unfolded, Lincoln stated his philosophy in these terms:

"When one starts poor, as most do in the race of life, free society is such that he knows he can better his condition; he knows that there is no fixed condition of labor for his whole life . . . I want every man to have the chance—and I believe a black man is entitled to it—in which he can better his condition—when he may look forward and hope to be a hired laborer this year and the next, work for himself afterward, and finally to hire men to work for him! That is the true system."<sup>2</sup>

In the same speech, Lincoln makes clear that the right to strike is integral to a democratic society, a policy reflected in the language of Sections 7 and 13 of the National Labor Relations Act and in the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932 which preceded it. Just a few weeks ago, President Clinton took note of one of our law's limitations in his statement criticizing the Bridgestons/Firestone Company's use of permanent striker replacements, noting that such tactics show the need to enact legislation prohibiting such a denial of the fundamental right to strike.

It bears note that Lincoln's view of labor and the right to strike ran against the tide of laissez-faire thinking which predominated in the previous century—thinking which has reared its head again toward the close of this century, one of its forms being the repressive striker replacement weapon of which President Clinton spoke. President Lincoln supported the right to strike and spoke out in the spring of 1860 in support of a well-organized strike conducted by the boot and shoe workers in New England. Lincoln regarded the right to strike by free labor as a "virtue, not a failing, of free society," as G.S. Boritt has written in "Lincoln and the Economics of the American Dream."<sup>3</sup>

Boritt also notes that during the Civil War several delegations of strikers from the Machinists and Blacksmiths Union of New York visited the White House and spoke to the President about their position. States Boritt:

"The labor representatives took great comfort from their interview, reasoning that although their employers refused to deal with them, Lincoln received them. 'If any man should again say that combinations of working men are not good,' they concluded, 'let them point to the Chief Magistrate.' They even quoted the President as saying 'I know that in almost every case of strikes, the men have just cause for complaint.' It is rather likely that the union men quoted Lincoln correctly."<sup>4</sup>

Of course, Lincoln's view of labor was closely related to his view of slavery. Again, in 1860 he said: "'Owned labor' would compete with free labor so as to 'degrade' the latter." And, in an earlier and lengthy speech to the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society in Milwaukee on September 30, 1859, he noted that the so-called "mud-sill" theory was that a hired laborer is "fatally fixed in that condition for life" and thus his condition is the same as that of a slave.<sup>5</sup>

But as Lincoln noted, this theory proceeded upon the assumption that labor and education were incompatible and that one could not improve oneself and one's family through free labor. Lincoln's view was antithetical to all of this. He held the view that workers should be able to rise to new horizons.

And this view is closely related to another held by the President which has similar contemporary implications. Because Lincoln believed that all people could improve themselves and thus rise out of their station if opportunity were afforded them, unlike other

proponents of the rights of labor, he did not see the working class as a well-defined unit, notwithstanding his endorsement of its use of the strike to defend its interests and act jointly in its dealings with employers. To some extent, said Professor Boritt, Lincoln shared the view that there was a harmony between the capital and labor and that it ought to be promoted so as to enhance the ability of workers to rise out of their class.

Again, these views resonate with us today as Congress considers proposals to enhance employee participation and proposed amendments to the National Labor Relations Act which will achieve this goal. I believe that President Lincoln would be sympathetic with contemporary efforts to promote employee involvement in the workplace and thus enhance our industry's global competitiveness—so long as such reforms do not interfere with the ability of the workers and unions to defend their own positions, a proposition that I have long advanced.<sup>6</sup>

The view that an individual was not "fatally fixed" in a particular condition forever constitutes the philosophy which prevailed in the Civil War and through the Emancipation Proclamation and the enactment of the Thirteenth Amendment which Lincoln sponsored before his assassination. Again, this is reflected anew in last month's State of the Union address by President Clinton when, in advocating new minimum wage legislation, he said that the worker who works must have his "reward" and that the job of government is to "expand opportunity . . . to empower people to make the most of their own lives. . . ."

This is what is at the heart of modern democracy and the Bill of Rights for workers in the private sector which are continued in the National Labor Relations Act and similar statutes. And this has been the assumption behind the struggle for equality which has attempted to make good on the promise of emancipation in the previous century.

My great-grandfather, a mason who worked with his mind and hands and established a business as a contractor, employing other workers in Dedham, Massachusetts, benefited from the above-noted philosophy and the quoted portions of the Emancipation Proclamation. Said William B. Gould on March 8, 1863, two months after its issuance:

"Read . . . the Proclamation of Emancipation . . . very [sic] good."

The policy, of course, had evolved in fits and starts. As Benjamin Quarles has noted in "The Negro in the Civil War," General Butler was the first to devise a policy of acceptance of blacks who wanted to fight with the North. This was, as Quarles noted, the most "insistent" problem faced by the Lincoln Administration in 1861 and 1862. It emerged, as he has noted, after the Union defeat at Bull Run which was attributable "in part to the Confederate military defenses constructed by slaves. . . ."

Congress enacted legislation which provided for the forfeiture of all slaves whose masters had permitted them to be used in the military or naval service of the Confederacy. Quarles notes that the 1861 legislation "strengthened the hand of the small band of Union officers from the beginning had been in favor of freeing the slaves." Two military initiatives—one designed by John C. Fremont in July 1861, "The Pathfinder," and the other undertaken by Major General Dave Hunter in the summer of 1862—were both rescinded by Lincoln out of his concern with preserving the allegiance of the border states.

The Confiscation Act enacted on July 17, 1862, declaring free all slaves who were owned by those in rebellion was the next step in the process. This had the effect of increasing the number of fugitives in whom

the United States Navy expressed a particular interest so as to make use of the information that they could provide about enemy locations and movements. As summer became fall the problem became more "insistent."

Three days after my great-grandfather boarded the USS *Cambridge* came this report of Commander G.H. Scott regarding the blockage of Wilmington:

"Fourteen contrabands have reached the 'Monticello' and 'Penobscot' and several the 'Cambridge' within a few days, and as the vessels have not room for them, will you please direct what disposition shall be made of them?"

We know what disposition was made of William B. Gould. On October 3, 1862, he said: "All of us shipped today for three years, first taking the Oath of Allegiance to the Government of Uncle Samuel."

Thus he, and eventually I, benefited from both the Confiscation Act and the new policy expressed in the Emancipation Proclamation which was not to be effective for another three months. His service was made possible because of it. This was then his opportunity—and his observations, hopes and views are chronicled in the diary which he kept between 1862 and 1865.

On the perils of the seas and their storminess, he says:

"[T]he gale still blows fresh and the seas running verry [sic] high. We shipped several through the night and one—fill'd the Ward Room with Water. I have got ducked awfully last night. It was worth something to be upon the Deck. Although there is much danger in a storm there is something very sublime to hear the roar of the storm. The hissing of the Waves, the whistling of the Rigging and the Cannon like report of the torn sail and above all the stern word of the commander and the—sound of the boatswain's pipe all adds to the grandeur of the scene. For there is something grand in a storm. Allnight with eager eyes both Officers and Men paced the deck watching our Foretopsail, feeling in a measure secure as long as we could sail at all. It has it stood through the night. There was no sign of the storm abateing [sic]. All the galley fire is out and nothing to eat is the cry and almost nothing to wear on account of the Water. Shine out fair sun and smote the Waves that we may proceed on our course and all be saved."

And on December 25 and December 27 of 1862, he had this to say about the loneliness of his work off New Inlet:

"This being Christmas I think of the table at home . . . cruised around as usual. Fine weather but very lonesome in the absence of news and we all had the Blues."

While on the North Atlantic Blockade with the USS *Cambridge* he says on November 17, 1862:

"A sail was reported close under the land right ahead. We gave chase. When within range of our boat we told them good morning in the shape of a shot for her to heave to."

But then he describes the difficulties that arose:

"To this [the shot] they took no notice. We sent another which fell under her stern . . . the ship stood for the Beach. Shot after shot was set after her but they heeded not . . . we immediately manned the first cutter and sent her . . . to board and destroy her. We also sent two other boats to lend assistance . . . [after sending a line to these boats so that they could return to the main ship] . . . they got the Boat all ready to come out when a body of Rebel Soldiers dashed over the hill at the double quick and all were prisoners. We could see them from the ship marching off our men and dragging the boats after them. We lost eleven men and three officers. Rather a bad day's work."

But the fortunes of war were not all negative as testified to by him in this entry in the summer of 1864 off Portugal:

"[W]e made a steamer and stood for her. She kept on her course without any until we got within 5 miles of her when she suddenly changed her course. We beat to Quarters and Fired a shot. She showed the English collars [sic]. We Fired another. When she came to be boarded her and found her to be the Rebel Privateer 'Georgia' from Liverpool on her way to refit a cruiser. But the next cruise that she makes will be for Uncle Samuel . . . this capture makes a crew feel verry [sic] proud."

While in the English Channel:

"[W]e took on board an English Pilot who brought the thrice glorious news of the sinking of the 'Alabama' by 'Kearsarge' off Cherbourg . . . [A]lthough we have been disappointment to us in not getting a shot at the 'Alabama' we are satisfied that she is out of the way."

And in 1864 while serving on the *Niagara* he said about the people that he saw in Spain:

"[I]t looks very strange in this country which nature have lavished with riches that there should be so many Poor People."

And again on the shameful treatment of black soldiers on his ship:

"Yesterday about 900 men of the Maryland (colored) regiment came on board (they being transferred to the Navy) and took dinner then departed for Portsmouth, New Hampshire. They were treated very rough by the crew. They refused to let them eat out of the mess pans and call them all kinds of names. One man [had] his watch stolen from him by these scoundrels. In all they were treated shamefully."

On the proposed colonization of blacks to Africa or the Caribbean:

"We see by the papers that President [Johnson] intimates colonization for the colored people of the United States. This move of his must and shall be resisted. We were born under the Flag of the union and never will we know no other. My sentiment is the sentiment of the people of the States."<sup>8</sup>

All of this ended in 1865 and provided William B. Gould with his chance at life. Sometimes I think about his thoughts as he walked the streets of Wilmington a young man and what would have been had he stayed in North Carolina and the events of those four critical years had not taken place. Most certainly his great-grandson would not be here today addressing you as Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

I am privileged to have this opportunity in 1995 to contribute to the public good in the most inspirational and progressive Administration in Washington since the 1960s—one which is unabashedly committed to the principles of those who fell 130 years ago.

My hope is that I can reflect well upon the first William B. Gould and the chance that he made for me by rising out of his "fixed station," to use Lincoln's words, and I am all too aware of the limitations of time as we move rapidly toward a new millennium.

As William B. Gould said on December 31, 1863, in New York harbor:

"We are obliged knock off on the account of the storm. It blew very hard from South East. The old year of '1863' went out furiously as if it was angry with all the world because it had finished the time allotted to it. Sooner or later we must follow."

My first major impression during my first trip outside of the United States in 1962, as a student at the London School of Economics, is of the grand and majestic statue of President Lincoln which sits in Parliament Square today. Now I live in Washington within a mile of the great Lincoln Memorial in which his brooding historical omnipresence is made so manifest.

You and I, the entire nation and the world honor President Lincoln and his policies tonight. Both personally and professionally they are with me always as is the legacy provided by him and so many others in what my great-grandfather called:

"[T]he holiest of all causes, Liberty and Union."<sup>9</sup>

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Basler, Roy P., Editor, "The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln," Volume VII, page 259, (1953).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., Volume IV, pp. 24-5.

<sup>3</sup>Boritt, Gabor, S., "Lincoln and the Economics of the American Dream," page 184, (1978).

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., page 185.

<sup>5</sup>Basler, Roy P., Editor, "The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln," Volume III, pp. 477-8 (1953).

<sup>6</sup>Of course, I advanced such ideas in the context of proposals for comprehensive labor law reform. See W. Gould, "Agenda for Reform: The Future of Employment Relationships and the Law," pp. 109-150 (1993).

<sup>7</sup>B. Quarles, "The Negro in the Civil War," pp. 59-61, 64 (1953). On blacks in the U.S. Navy see generally, D. Valuska, "The African American in the Union Navy: 1861-1865," (1993).

<sup>8</sup>Of course, President Lincoln had earlier proposed colonization within the context of compensated emancipation.

<sup>9</sup>Diary May 6, 1864. The full text actually states, "[H]eard of the departure of one battalion of the 5th Regiment Massachusetts Cavalry from Camp Meigs for Washington, D.C. May God protect them while defending the holiest of all causes, Liberty and Union." As William B. Gould III wrote in an entry adjacent to the diary: "Camp Meigs was in Readville, Massachusetts, about two miles east of where William B. Gould made his home at 303 Milton Street, East Dedham, Massachusetts."

### THE FOOD STAMP INTEGRITY ACT OF 1995

#### HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Food Stamp Program Integrity Act of 1995. This bill is a comprehensive package of reforms, developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, targeting fraud and abuse in the Food Stamp Program. It will allow USDA to focus its resources on the small number of retailers who abuse their privilege of participating in the Food Stamp Program. It will expand the current authority of USDA to screen retailers when they apply to participate in the Food Stamp Program, and enhance penalties when retailers defraud the program. It will expand forfeiture authority to allow the seizure of retailer property used or derived from illegal food stamp trafficking. It will increase access to retailer documents to verify the legitimacy of the stores applying to participate in the program.

I believe that this bill can be a vehicle to fashion a program integrity title to food stamp welfare reform, which will be marked up at the Agriculture Committee next week.

### THE CORPORATE WRONGDOERS PROTECTION ACT

#### HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, many people may have heard of or read the best-selling book "The Hot Zone" recently. This

thriller details the true story of rare and lethal viruses that have the potential to destroy a significant percentage of the human population in a very short time span.

Well, there is a related type of virus spreading these days on Capitol Hill. It also has the potential to claim countless victims throughout our Nation, perpetrating injuries as serious as any disease or epidemic.

But this virus is one of gross misinformation. What is spreading so rapidly is the fallacy that the GOP's "Contract With Corporate America" product liability legislation, H.R. 917 and H.R. 956, would not hurt consumers.

The fact is, these bills would decrease product safety for all consumers, but, in particular, it would devastate and devalue American women.

Particular provisions within the legislation touted by the majority would shield manufacturers of products like DES, silicone breast implants, and IUD's from punitive damages as long as they receive FDA approval—even when their actions were outrageous and hundreds of women were injured as a result.

These bills would also restrict the recovery of noneconomic damages, so that a highly paid male corporate executive with a 3-month-long injury would be more fully compensated than a woman whose principal injury is the permanent loss of reproductive capacity, or an injured woman who has chosen to stay at home and raise her children.

H.R. 917 and H.R. 956 would also do nothing to restrict the use of secrecy agreements or protective orders that prevent the public from learning about unsafe products, as was the case with the secrecy agreements that kept Dow Corning's information about the dangers of its silicone breast implants hidden from the public eye for so many years. How many women must be severely injured from the same product before we become outraged and take action?

The bottom line is clear: if Congress passes this legislation, women would suffer. Women would face harsher odds when taking the chance of trying a drug or medical device. Women would find that the concepts of justice and full compensation have been significantly carved. Women would find that their safety is less important to manufacturers than corporate profits. Women would find that they are less equal in the eyes of the law.

These are disasters that must not be allowed to occur. If any product liability measure is to advance through Congress, we must be sure that it is first altered so as to protect the safety of America's mothers, sisters, and daughters.

### CLOUDS OVER THE WHITE HOUSE

SPEECH OF

#### HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 28, 1995*

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, over the past year to year and one-half, we have seen some very disturbing things come out of this administration. A lot of people that the American people put their confidence in have left under a cloud.

Let me just mention a few of them. Webster Hubbell, the second most powerful person in the Justice Department, a very close personal friend of President Clinton, he was Associate Attorney General. He left the Justice Department after having been accused of fraudulent billing practices in his old law firm and he pled guilty to Federal crimes and he is under indictment right now, and I understand he is plea bargaining. He was the second most important, if you will, person in the Justice Department, and he himself is indicted and will probably go to prison unless he plea bargains his way out of that. He was the person who helped influence, in my opinion, helped influence the decision not to indict Ron Brown when they sent the associate justice down to the Miami grand jury about a year ago, and instead of letting the local U.S. attorney down there handle the case, they came back and said they did not indict Mr. Brown because of the Vietnamese affair, because they did not have enough evidence. There was not enough evidence to indict. They did not say they did not have evidence, they said there was not enough to indict.

David Watkins, a White House official, was forced to resign after using Marine helicopters to go play golf. He also was accused of sexual harassment by a Clinton campaign worker, and the campaign, the Clinton campaign settled and attempted to receive Federal matching funds, your tax dollars, to pay for the settlement. They were trying to get taxpayers' moneys as matching funds to help pay this sexual harassment suit. He left under a cloud.

Richard Altman, the Deputy Treasury Secretary, he resigned after congressional hearings exposed the improper contacts he had with the White House officials about the Whitewater investigation.

Bernard Nussbaum, the chief White House counsel, the right-hand legal man at the White House for President Clinton, he resigned after improper contacts with the Treasury Department over the Whitewater investigation came out. He is also the person who went into Vince Foster's office and took files out right after they found Vince Foster dead under suspicious conditions over at Fort Marcy Park. Mike Espy, the Agriculture Secretary, he resigned under investigation by independent counsel for accepting illegal gifts. Joycelyn Elders, the Surgeon General, resigned after advocating legalization of drugs and teaching masturbation in schools.

There are other Clinton administration nominees that were controversial who were not confirmed, Lani Guinier, Morton Halperin. Morton Halperin could not be confirmed as Assistant Secretary of Defense. What did they do? Because of his leftist policies, they took him over to the White House, put him in the NSC, National Security Council, advising the President where he would not have to be confirmed. Zoe

Baird and Kimba Wood, nominees for Attorney General, they withdrew them after they investigated them.

Those are just a few of the nominees and people in the administration who left under a cloud. This administration has had a policy of picking people that had not been thoroughly examined and people who have come, we have come to find out, have done some things very questionable, of very questionable nature.

Now, I want to talk about Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown. He was the fellow about 1½ years ago or 2 years ago that was accused of taking a \$700,000 bribe from the Vietnamese Government to normalize relations with that country. The FBI conducted a 6-hour lie detector on his chief accuser, a man named Ben Lee, and the man passed it. They even put a bug on this man. Yet when Webster Hubbell was over at the Justice Department in the No. 2 position after President Clinton took office, they took the FBI off of the case, and when the press got so hot on this issue and a grant jury was impaneled down in Miami, the Justice Department, again, Webster Hubbell was still second in command over there, they sent one of the assistants down to conduct the grand jury investigation instead of having it done locally, and they did not have enough evidence to indict. That was the Vietnamese affair.

Now, we have a lot of other problems with Mr. Brown, Secretary of Commerce. I doubt if any Cabinet Secretary in recent history has had as many bad investments and delinquent loans as Commerce Secretary Ron Brown. He and his business partners have on several occasions borrowed large sums of money through shell corporations to avoid personal responsibility for the loans, and then failed to repay them.

Ron Brown is now the subject of a second Justice Department investigation into his finances. In 1993, the Justice Department investigated allegations that he was offered this \$700,000 bribe to have the embargo against Vietnam lifted even though we did not have a full accounting of the 2,300 POW-MIA's, and we still do not have that.

The Justice Department did not indict Mr. Brown in that case, but they did not exonerate him either. They said they just did not have enough evidence to indict him.

The Justice Department has launched a second investigation, this one into Secretary Brown's financial relationship with a lady named Nolanda Hill. Under the independent counsel law, the Attorney General has 90 days to recommend to a three-judge panel whether to appoint an independent counsel.

Now, let me give you some highlights of Secretary Brown's bad debts and forgiven loans. The first one is really interesting. NBC, the National Broadcasting Co., forgave a \$10 million loan to Ron Brown. The Washington Post

reported this weekend that NBC has agreed to forgive a \$10 million loan to one of Ron Brown's companies, Albimar Communications.

In 1988, NBC agreed to sell Washington, DC, radio station WKYS-FM to Albimar Communications for \$42½ million. Albimar was formed by Ron Brown, Secretary of Commerce, and his partners, Bertram Lee and James Kelly, husband of former D.C. Mayor Sharon Pratt Kelly.

To make the deal possible, NBC loaned Albimar and Ron Brown \$10 million, because Brown, Lee, and Kelly are all black. NBC received a \$15 million tax break for minority business people as a result of the sale.

The House just voted to rescind this tax break with some justification, I might add. The investment quickly went sour, and Ron Brown and his partners became seriously delinquent on the loan from NBC.

Earlier this year, Brown, Kelly, and Lee agreed to sell WKYS to another company for an \$8.5 million loss. The key to the deal was NBC forgiving the \$10 million loan.

Now, here are some questions that the Congress and this Government need to have answered. First, was this arrangement with NBC approved by the Office of Government Ethics? And if it was not, why not?

Second, is it legal for a sitting Cabinet Secretary in a Presidential administration to receive a financial windfall of this magnitude from a major corporation over which he has some control? Agricultural Secretary Mike Espy is being investigated for accepting a pair of football tickets from a company regulated by his agency, much less than the \$10 million loan that was forgiven I just talked about from NBC.

Third, does NBC have an interest in any matters pending before the Commerce Department? Now, it is hard to believe that a major broadcasting company would not have something pending before the U.S. Commerce Department, and here they are forgiving a \$10 million loan to the Secretary of Commerce. NBC is owned by RCA, Radio Corporation of America. How many Federal agencies are considering regulatory matters that RCA has a stock in, cellular phones, all kinds of new technologies that are being developed by RCA and other corporations that go before the Commerce Department? And do those companies that NBC is affiliated with, do they have any interest in things pending before the Commerce Department?

Fifth, what did NBC and RCA expect to get in return for forgiving this loan, if anything?

Now, this is not the only thing Ron Brown has been involved in. First International, Inc., and Corridor Broadcasting cost the taxpayers \$40 million. In the 1980's Ron Brown and Democratic activist Nolanda Hill formed a corporation named First International Communications.

Nolanda Hill owned a second corporation named Corridor Broadcasting. Corridor operated out of the same office as First International and used all of the same computers, the same phones, and the same office equipment.

Corridor Broadcasting defaulted on \$40 million in loans and left the taxpayers holding the bag. While it could not repay these loans, it was paying, at the same time they could not repay the loans to the taxpayers, it was paying \$12,000 a month in interest to Ron Brown and Nolanda Hill through First International. They were in the same office using the same phones, same computers, and everything else.

Ron Brown said he did not know anything about what was going on with Corridor Broadcasting. It was in the same office, and Corridor Broadcasting, which defaulted on a \$40 million obligation to the taxpayers, was paying \$12,000 a month in interest to Ron Brown's company. Although Ron Brown invested none of his own money in the company and the company had no known successful ventures, Nolanda Hill paid Secretary Brown, now get this, she paid him \$400,000 for his share of the company. He put no money into the company, no investment whatsoever. The company that was paying the freight, Corridor Broadcasting, Inc., Corridor defaulted. The taxpayers are soaking up \$40 million in losses.

Ron Brown made no financial investment in the company that was in the same office, and yet he was paid \$400,000, and the company went defunct. The company went belly up, and he gets \$400,000. For what? That is the question. For what?

Now, Ron Brown, in addition to the \$400,000, had \$190,000 in personal debts. According to Secretary Brown's lawyer, part of the payout from First International was \$190,000 Nolanda Hill spent in 1994 paying off Ron Brown's debts. She paid off \$190,000 of his debts. He paid no money for the company, got \$400,000 out of it, and she pays \$190,000 off on his personal debts.

Question: To whom did Secretary Brown owe the \$190,000? This is information that the Congress and the public deserves to know.

And then there was another company in that same office. This is the third company in the same office called Know, Inc. In 1992 Nolanda Hill, through a third shell company, called Know, Inc., loaned Ron Brown \$78,000. Brown used this money to repay a personal debt to the National Bank of Washington. This was done just before his confirmation hearings before the U.S. Senate. After his nomination had been confirmed, now get this, Nolanda Hill forgave this debt also, so he got \$190,000 that she forgave, paid for, I assume out of the \$40 million that they defaulted on, \$190,000 she loaned him, and forgave or paid, and \$78,000 she loaned him and forgave, and then \$400,000 he got for no investment. Boy, I want to tell you, that is the kind of investment I would like to make.

Now, I serve on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and the chairman of that committee is Chairman CLINGER, and he and the staff of our committee have conducted an investigation, and he has contacted Attorney General Janet Reno and asked there be a special investigator, special counsel, appointed, independent counsel, to investigate allegations against Ron Brown. This investigation has developed specific allegations which the committee believes are sufficient to warrant the appointment of an independent counsel, Mr. CLINGER said. The allegations are divided into five categories: First, submission of incomplete, inaccurate, and misleading financial disclosure statements; second, supplementation of salary; third, potential conflicts of interest; fourth, misinformation to Congress, and fifth refusing to respond to Congress.

Now, let us go through these allegations real quickly. The first allegation, Secretary Brown failed to report his interest in and income from First International Communications, Limited Partnership, on his annual incumbent financial disclosure form. Why did he not put that on that report? The factual basis for the allegation is this; Secretary Brown's annual incumbent financial disclosure report, signed May 16, 1994, failed to identify an interest in First International Communications, Limited Partnership. He did not even tell he was involved in that corporation, and he got \$400,000 for it for no investment. Although it is unclear whether the Secretary still held an interest in First International Communications, Limited Partnership, on December 31, 1993, the Secretary received three \$45,000 payments from First International Communications, Limited Partnership, during that year 1993. The first two checks dated April 15 and July 21 state that the checks were for "Partnership distribution." Distribution of what? The company was going under. They had no assets except what was in that office that was owned also by Corridor, Inc., and yet he has getting all this money for no investment.

The third check, dated October 15, simply says "Distribution." Secretary Brown should have reported these payments as income during 1993 even though he no longer held an interest in the partnership at the end of that year.

(B) First International Communications Corp. and First International, Inc., allegations, Secretary Brown failed to accurately describe the basic activities of First International on his new entrant financial disclosure report. On his new entrant financial disclosure report signed January 1, 1993, Secretary Brown stated First International "is a company that provides international and domestic consulting and investment services." Contrary to the Secretary's contention, the committee's evidence indicates First International was not involved in any sort of consulting or investment services at

all. He misled what the intent of the company was on his report.

Rather, its primary source of income was interest generated by a promissory note worth approximately \$875,000 payable by Corridor Broadcasting. I would like to know where that \$875,000 came from.

Despite having defaulted on federally insured loans in excess of \$40 million by 1993, Corridor Broadcasting apparently continued to pay monthly interest payments of approximately \$12,000 to First International on the \$875,000 note. In short, while the American taxpayers were forced to absorb more than \$40 million of Corridor's indebtedness, Corridor continued to pay \$12,000 a month to Mr. Brown's company.

Third, well, let me give you some factual basis on that real quickly. According to his annual incumbent financial disclosure report, Secretary Brown divested his interest in First International December 15, 1993, receiving between \$250,000 and \$500,000. We believe it was around \$400,000.

Secretary Brown states in exchange for his share of First International he received direct payment of \$135,000 and on and on and on. I covered a lot of this already. I will not go into it again.

(D) Purchase of a town house. Allegation: On his annual incumbent financial disclosure report, Secretary Brown failed to report either the execution of a promissory note or a gift of \$108,000 used as downpayment for a town house located in Washington, DC. According to his annual incumbent financial disclosure report in 1993, Secretary Brown had a mortgage of \$250,000 to \$500,000 on a town house located at 4303 Westover Place in Washington, DC. The mortgage was held by First Federal Savings and Loan of Rochester. In addition, Secretary Brown disclosed \$5,000 to \$15,000 in rental income generated by this property in 1993.

Although this townhouse is the residence of Secretary Brown's friend, Lillian Madsen, the deed of trust lists Ronald H. Brown and Michael Brown, his son, as owners of the property. Other relevant real estate documents indicate that a down payment of \$108,000 was made to purchase the property.

As reported by U.S. News & World Report in February of 1995, Brazilian businessman Jose Amaro Pinto Ramos arranged for a substantial loan for a down payment on the townhouse to be made to Lillian Madsen through a bank in Paris, France. Ramos claimed he never spoke to Secretary Brown about the loan, and he was unaware that the Secretary owned the property. Unaware?

According to the deed of trust now in effect, Ronald Brown and Michael Brown jointly own the property, subject only to the first mortgage of \$252,000. No second mortgage or other encumbrance is listed on the property. Thus the Browns are the owners of \$108,000 equity down payment. If Ms. Madsen provided the down payment, if

Ms. Madsen provided the \$108,000 down payment which is now owned by the Browns, the Secretary should have reported that down payment as a gift or as income. Where did she get \$108,000 to pay down on that?

You know, it was alleged Ron Brown got \$700,000 in payment from the Vietnamese Government to normalize relations with Vietnam. The FBI verified that there was an electronic transfer of funds from the North Vietnamese Communist Government to a bank in Singapore just like the accuser, Mr. Bun Lee said. So maybe that \$700,000 was paid. The money was transferred. There was a large sum of money transferred to a bank in Singapore, just as the accuser said.

On the other hand, if Ronald Brown or Michael Brown arranged some sort of off-the-record agreement to eventually repay Ms. Madsen, Secretary Brown should have reported that agreement as a liability on his annual incumbent financial disclosure report.

Funds provided by Ms. Madsen were not reported as a gift, as income, or as a liability on Secretary Brown's annual incumbent financial disclosure reports.

Next allegation: Secretary Brown failed to report on his financial disclosure report that his interest in Boston Bank of Commerce Associates was a general partnership. Secretary Brown's new-entrant financial disclosure report does not identify Boston Bank of Commerce Associates as a general partnership. According to the Office of Government Ethics, the fact that the Boston Bank of Commerce Associates is a general partnership was discovered in April 1993. According to ethics law, the known interests of a general partner are imputed to the other owners, the other general partners. One of Secretary Brown's partners in Boston Bank of Commerce Associates provided Digital Equipment Corp. stock as capital in return for his partnership share. Thus imputing an interest in Digital to Boston Bank of Commerce Associates and the Secretary.

Upon discovery, an apparent screening process was instituted to bar the Secretary from taking official action that would affect Digital.

Albimar Communications, Inc., allegations: Secretary Brown failed to report on his new-entrant financial disclosure report and his annual incumbent financial disclosure report that his interests in Albimar Communications was a general partnership. According to both of his financial disclosure reports, Secretary Brown held an interest in Albimar Communications, which owns a radio station, WKYS, in Washington, DC. I have already gone into that. That is the loan that was forgiven, \$10 million, by NBC.

Payment of Secretary Brown's personal debt obligation, allegation: Secretary Brown failed to accurately report the future income he knew he would receive in 1994 on his annual incumbent financial disclosure report. According to his own incumbent re-

port, Secretary Brown divested himself of his interest in First International on December 15, 1993, receiving, we believe, around \$400,000. They say between \$250,000 to \$500,000 in this report. Secretary Brown claimed his divestiture of First International, which allegedly occurred on December 15, 1993, included, in part, the payment of some of his personal debt obligations. The evidence shows that the debt obligations were paid by or through Noland Hill, but on December 15, 1993; rather the payments were made during the summer of 1994, specifically nine payments totaling \$190,995, against various debt obligations of Secretary Brown, were made to the following entities on the following dates—and they are all listed here.

I can go on and on and on and on. I would like to submit the rest of these things for the RECORD. I pretty much covered that. But these are things that need to be investigated, if not by the Justice Department, through an independent counsel, they ought to be investigated by the Congress itself. But I talked to Representative CLINGER today, and if the Justice Department does not ask for an independent counsel, it is my belief that we will hold hearings on this and Congress will get to the bottom of it. In other words, we are going to let an independent counsel, if he is duly appointed by a three-judge panel after being asked by Attorney General Reno, we will let it go that route. But if it does not, then the House of Representatives, I believe, will hold hearings and call Mr. Brown to testify to answer these allegations and questions.

The second thing I want to talk about before I get to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], is something that happened today in Little Rock, AR. The special prosecutor, a special prosecutor appointed by the three-judge panel to replace Mr. Fiske, today indicted a man named Neal T. Ainley, who is a bank president in Little Rock, AR. He was president of the Perry County Bank in Perryville, AR, from 1989 until March 1994.

According to this indictment, he loaned \$180,000 to Mr. Clinton during the 1990 gubernatorial campaign. That money was used by the Clinton campaign to buy or try to get some votes. It is alleged that some black ministers were the beneficiaries of a lot of this money that was used in order to get out some of the votes in critical precincts in Arkansas.

The interesting thing about this is, right after the election took place and Mr. Clinton was reelected Governor, the owner of the bank became the secretary of transportation for the State, secretary of the highway department in Little Rock. And he, along with the bank officials, according to the indictment, helped repay the \$180,000 loan that Mr. Clinton incurred during the campaign.

The question is where did that \$180,000 come from? Did it come from highway contractors that the new head of the highway department twisted their arms in order to get those monies to repay those loans? Where did that money come from? That is something that needs to be looked into.

I am sure Mr. Star is doing that.

I might say at this point that Mr. Starr is doing an outstanding job as the independent counsel, and I think everybody in the country ultimately will see that and owe him a great debt of gratitude.

But there are so many cases like that in Arkansas; there is another bank down there where was a \$400,000 loan that was given to try to get legislation through the Arkansas State Legislature, and that money was never repaid either by the person that borrowed the money. And it was in the Clinton administration.

Here you have \$180,000 borrowed that was repaid by a person who got a job in the administration, running the highway department and the person that got the job at the highway department was the owner of the bank that loaned the money.

It sure does smell bad.

Then we come to the Mexican bailout, which 80 percent of the American people oppose. January 31, President Clinton and Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin announced a \$49.8 billion—\$49.8 billion; that is not millions, that is billions, three extra zeros—\$49,800,000,000 bailout package for Mexico.

The package included \$20 billion in loans and loan guarantees from the Treasury Department's exchange stabilization fund, which was established in the 1930's to protect the value of the dollar and not other currencies. This exchange stabilization fund was established to protect the dollar in the international financial markets against an assault from other currencies, to protect the dollar. We are using \$20 billion of it to protect the Mexican peso, which is in a free fall right now. So the United States taxpayer is underwriting the Mexican Government's economic mistakes. The key underwriters of Mexico's dollar-denominated bonds, called tesobonos, have been the major United States investment banking firms. Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, and this is very important, Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin was formerly cochairman of the Goldman-Sachs Investment Co. from 1992 to 1994. Goldman-Sachs was the largest United States underwriter of Mexican bonds. Although Rubin divested himself of his interest in Goldman-Sachs, there is still a conflict of interest. There was \$5.17 billion in investments made by Goldman-Sachs into the Mexican markets, more than double the other companies, the next two highest companies that invested in Mexico.

When Secretary Rubin joined the White House staff in 1993 as Chairman of the National Economic Council, he



recused himself, stepped aside for 1 year on all issues affecting Mexico. At that time, he was with the National Economic Council. Now he is the Treasury Secretary, and the Treasury Secretary has sole control over the exchange stabilization fund, where they took that \$20 billion out of to give to Mexico. The only person that could stop him from doing that is the President himself, and yet he did not recuse himself this year. He did 2 years ago, when he did not have any power. Now, as Secretary of the Treasury, he can send \$20 billion down there, he does not recuse himself, he stays involved.

Now, there are a lot of questions that arise from that. Why did not he recuse himself? Could it be because of \$5.17 billion that he had his clients invest in Mexico was under assault? That many of the people he recommended put their money into these Mexican financial instruments were going to lose their shirt because the peso was in free fall? And that he might be held responsible? He said he had a very large insurance policy to protect him against suits emanating from his recommendations. But, you know, I used to sell insurance, and I can tell you, if you got a million-dollar policy or \$10 million or even a \$50 million policy, it costs an arm and a leg. Here we are talking about not \$50 million but \$5,000,000,000, \$5 billion. And if he were sued because of making—giving bad financial advice and investing in very bad speculative securities in Mexico, he probably could have been sued and it could have wiped out not only maybe his company, in large part, but himself and his whole personal fortune.

So he had a vested interest, a vested interest in making sure that the money got down to Mexico to try to stabilize the peso in that economy. He should have recused himself. That is why there should be a complete congressional investigation.

I understand the Committee on Banking is going to do that. We had a press conference today, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Banking said they were going to call Mr. Rubin before them to ask questions about these things.

Now, let me tell you some other things about Mr. Rubin. Employees of his company, Goldman-Sachs, especially Mr. Rubin himself, contributed heavily to the Clinton campaign and the Democrat Party. Goldman-Sachs employees and families were responsible for the largest contribution the Clinton campaign got in 1992 from a single firm, almost \$100,000.

Robert Rubin and his wife contributed \$275,000 to the New York Host Committee for the Democrat National Convention in 1992. A Washington lobbyist for Goldman-Sachs, Michael Berman, was instrumental in setting up President Clinton's legal defense fund and is actively soliciting contributions to it. The fund was established to pay his expenses, President Clinton's ex-

penses in the sexual harassment lawsuit filed by Paul Cobin Jones.

So this company, Goldman-Sachs, and Mr. Rubin are tied inextricably together, and they are the largest investor in Mexico, investing so much of their clients' funds down there and now he is trying to stabilize the Mexican economy, which will help protect his investors' money. If that is not a conflict of interest, I do not know what is. Yet he did not recuse himself and says he did nothing wrong.

This is something that is very, very serious. Mr. Rubin and the administration are evidently using the United States taxpayers' money not to the tune of \$20 billion but overall to the tune of about \$55 billion to help stabilize the Mexican economy, and that is a real crap shoot because if that economy continues to go like it is, the American people, taxpayers, might very well have to pay the \$55 billion. And it will not be worth a dime.

They say that they are going to use the oil sales of Mexico to guarantee repayment of the loan, but there are so many financial obligations against the Mexican Government, not to mention what is coming out of the United States from the exchange stabilization fund and these other funds that if they went under, if they had an economic collapse down there, they could not repay all of these loans. And I doubt seriously if the United States of America would ask them to pay out of their oil sales because they would need that money for current expenses. How would the government, how would the country survive if they did not have any income coming in? They would not have, if we took away something like their oil sales.

So this whole Mexican bailout in a debacle. They could not get it through the Congress of the United States. They could not get the votes so unilaterally the President and Mr. Rubin decided to do it. Now we find out that there may have been some ulterior motives for Mr. Rubin taking this action and President Clinton for going along with it. It is a real mess. I think that my colleagues and I ought to take a hard look at this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman's permission, I would like to ask a few questions based on the discussions you have had here in the House this evening about the very important questions dealing with Secretary Brown and as well the crisis that we have now in Mexico and with the intervention of the United States precipitously by the President without any congressional involvement.

Let me first ask you, with regard to Secretary Brown and the Clinton administration, is it your opinion that the lawyers resigning and the Cabinet members leaving under a cloud, does this tell you anything unusual about the Clinton administration, whether or

not there was sufficient investigations done?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, we have found through our investigation, we used to have what was called the Republican Study Committee. I chaired that. We did extensive investigation into Whitewater, Whitewater Development Corp. and the Arkansas Development Financial Authority and a lot of other things. We have found an awful lot of questionable activity that took place under the Clinton administration in Arkansas. And a lot of the people who were involved in the Clinton administration in Arkansas were brought to Washington by President Clinton to help in his administration.

If you look at the things that we are finding out about many of those people, some of their activities, like Webster Hubbell, his illegal activities were taking place prior to the time he came to be in the administration. It seems to me that the President, when he was Governor, would have known or should have known about some of the activities of these people, because he surrounded himself with them during the entire time he was Governor, which was over a long period of time, over 10 years. So it is inconceivable that he could not have known at least something about these people.

It is unfortunate that he brought them to Washington, because now they are leaving. As one of my colleagues said today, it is like a rusty door on rusty hinges. It is about to fall over. It does a disservice not only to the administration but to the entire country.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. What about the \$700,000 bribe? What was the final upshot of that case.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The \$700,000 alleged bribe, the man who made the allegation was a man named Binh Ly who was working with a Korean or a Vietnamese agent named Mr. Hao. Mr. Ly and Mr. Hao went to Vietnam to try to normalize relations with that government, tried to work out some kind of a normalization relationship. Mr. Ly wanted to do it because he is a patriot. He believed that they ought to get away from the Communist regime and get to free enterprise over there. He thought this was a way to do it.

When he got over there, he found out from Mr. Hao that there was an alleged \$700,000 payment to be made to Mr. Brown as a first installment, a first installment on payments to him as a good-faith installment to get him to help use his position in the government to normalize relations with Vietnam.

We found many cases where Mr. Brown or people on his staff at the Commerce Department did take action at various high level meetings over at the White House to try to get the normalization process started. As you know, they were successful. We are on a path toward complete normalization with Vietnam, even though we have never gotten a full accounting on the POW/MIAs that were left behind and we never did find out if the \$700,000 was

really paid, because Mr. Hubbell and Janet Reno, they sent one of their top lieutenants down there to whitewash the grand jury investigation in Miami, I believe.

As a result, we do not know whether the money was paid. The FBI did say, however, that what Mr. Ly said in the lie detector test, which he passed, took 6 hours, that the money that was alleged to have been sent from the Vietnamese Government to a bank in Singapore could very well have happened because there was a large transfer of funds from the Vietnamese Government to a bank in Singapore at the same time that all this took place. So Mr. Brown could have received that money.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, do I understand you correctly, where we have possible prisoners in Vietnam, we have somebody working for the White House willing to sell out their country for \$700,000? Is that correct?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is the allegation that was made because there are still people who believe there are POW/MIAs that may still be alive over there. A lot of people who served in Vietnam believe that. Even if they are not alive, we had a commitment from every single President since the Vietnam war who has said we would not do business or normalize relations with Vietnam until we had a complete accounting. Of the 2,300 that are still unaccounted for over there, I would say probably 2,000 still are unaccounted for. And yet we are normalizing relations. American industry is being allowed to invest over there. Mr. Brown is playing a very key role in getting that down.

The allegation that Mr. Ly made was that the \$700,000 was just a down payment and that Mr. Brown was supposed to get royalties or a percentage of the oil that was developed from the oil fields off the shore of Vietnam, which is supposed to be the third largest oil field in the world.

We are talking about tens and hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I just personally find that offensive that we could have our boys back there possibly still in the field before we got a total accounting, that some individual was willing to sell out his country for \$700,000.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am sure it was more than that. But the bottom line is that when the grand jury investigated Mr. Brown, they did not exonerate him. They said they did not have enough evidence to indict. And when the FBI was pulled off the case, I believe at the request of the Justice Department and Web Hubbell and Janet Reno, I think they did a real disservice to the country and to those families that have those 2,000 or 2,300 people still left unaccounted for over there.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of the House would like to know as well as the public, what is it with regard, if we have

delinquent loans and we have forgiven loans which are questionable and we have failure to file with the government authorities on limited partnerships with the Secretary of Commerce here, in your opinion, do you think that we have sufficient evidence or information so that the independent counsel could be appointed?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes. I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman CLINGER, of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, made a very, very strong case when he wrote to Janet Reno this week, when he asked her, he cited case after case after case after case where there are allegations of wrongdoing and breaking of the law by Mr. Brown. And he said that he would allow her to and he urged her to pick an independent counsel through the three-judge panel. And if she does that and we get a truly independent counsel to investigate these allegations, then he felt like there would not be a necessity for the Congress to conduct hearings.

However, as I said before, if that does not take place, I talked to Chairman CLINGER today, and I am convinced or under the impression that we will hold hearings if we do not get that independent counsel.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If there would not be an independent counsel, in your opinion, you believe that the Committee on the Judiciary or the Government Reform and Oversight Committee would have the right to do its own investigation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, I think, would have jurisdiction in this case. And I think we would be the committee that would hold the hearings. I would urge the chairman to do that, and I believe he will.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on this latest indictment, we have Neal Ainley that is connected to a questionable campaign loan back to the Clinton administration.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes. That was a \$180,000 non-secured loan, and that loan was made by this Mr. Neal Ainley. He was president of this bank in Perryville, AR, called the Perry County Bank. And this guy, I do not know, he may be the scapegoat, I do not know.

The thing that is interesting is, as I said before, the owner of the bank, not the president, but the owner of the bank became the head of the State Highway Department. And he assisted, as I understand it, the bank officials in raising the money to pay off the loan.

And all I can think of is some of the highway scandals I heard of before where highway contractors were urged to cough up money to take care of various needs of administration officials in other States. And it seems to me a \$180,000 loan that was made by a bank and then the owner of that bank becomes a State highway official, the top dog there, and then he helps repay the loan, it seems to me he had to get that

money from someplace so we ought to investigate where that money came from.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I know that you and Congressman STOCKMAN have been very much at the forefront of the public outcry about this whole Mexican bailout. I wanted to ask you a couple of questions so that we can have our colleagues understand where we are at this point.

In your opinion, is the Clinton \$20 billion loan guarantee an overreaching by the executive branch without congressional intervention whatsoever, an obligation that should have been to the American people first in forming the Congress, and that the executive branch, through the President, should not have taken action?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes. It is an absolute travesty, in my opinion, that the American people were not listened to and that the people's House and the Senate were not consulted about this bailout.

The fact of the matter is, and I wanted to congratulate Mr. STOCKMAN for his hard work in trying to bring this issue to the floor, I think he will prevail to get it to the floor, but the fact of the matter is, I was one of the people that worked on the initial legislation that was being drafted to try to work out the kinks to be able to help stabilize the economy in Mexico. And some of the things that we put in there in the legislation before we would guarantee the loan was that there had to be at least about 30 percent of the loan put into American banks in the form of negotiable securities so if the Government of Mexico defaulted, we could get right off the top real fast 30 percent of the loan back. And if we did that in a timely fashion, we probably would not suffer any loss and the taxpayer would suffer no loss in this country, even though we did help stabilize the economy down there.

In addition to that, we have provisions in the bill that said Mexico could no longer help the Communist Government of Cuba. Right now the Mexican Government, through direct or indirect financial assistance to Castro, are giving him \$200 million to \$400 million a year. We guaranteed these loans, and they continue to do business with Castro. We have an embargo against Castro, 90 miles from our shore, the last bastion of communism in the world. And here the Mexican Government is helping Cuba to a large degree, and we are bailing them out. And I would not be a bit surprised if some of the money that we are giving to them to bail them out is not funneling its way over to Castro to keep him afloat. So we put a provision in there that said that no money could get to Castro. We also put a provision in there that said that we had to protect our borders and Mexico had to help. They had to work with us on both sides of the 1,980-mile border between us and Mexico to keep illegal aliens from coming out. And we also

had a provision in there to send prisoners in United States jails, and we have hundreds, probably have a couple hundred thousand of them, back to Mexico for execution of sentence, because it is costing the American taxpayers \$30,000 to \$35,000 apiece to keep them incarcerated here. So we had a lot of provisions in the bill to protect the taxpayer.

Now, the President and Mr. Rubin and the Mexican officials said, we do not want any conditions on the money. Get that. They did not want any conditions on the money.

And so we said, you are not going to get the votes in the Congress to pass that, or the Senate, and the American people are not going to support a loan bailout unless there is protections on the money.

We can guarantee we are going to get at least so much of our money back and that these other provisions in there to protect our borders and to stop them from doing business with Castro and in violation of the embargo. So what happens is the President says, hey, if we cannot get Congress to do it, I will do it myself. And he used the Exchange Stabilization Fund in violation of what we believe the law is because that money is supposed to only be used to stabilize the dollar. And he is using it to stabilize the peso. So he did an end around the American taxpayer and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I would like to understand that. He transferred from what I understand, Rubin transferred \$7 billion as opposed to the loan guarantees already \$7 billion. He originally asked for \$40 billion. It is up now to \$53 billion. And this thing keeps spiraling out of control. And today shocking news that was reported over the Mexican airwaves, I do not know if it is true or not, but the brother of the former president of Mexico participated in the assassination down there in Mexico. That is going to drive the markets down further. I think we have just been ripped off, and the American taxpayer is going to end up paying for this failure of Clinton to realize that this is a bad deal. This is a ripoff, and originally it was loan guarantees. Now it is outright payments to Mexico. This is a travesty.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think the gentleman is absolutely right, \$7 billion has already gone down there. The peso continues to drop. And every time it drops, that means its relationship to the dollar drops, which means that they are going to have to use this money to bail themselves out. And that \$7 billion is very likely done. We might as well have burned it up in the middle of the street. It is not saving the Mexican economy. The taxpayers of this country, 80 percent of them did not want us to do it anyhow. So since the President cannot get it down through Congress, he does it by himself. This is not a dictatorship.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Not only that, the people of Mexico were opposed to it.

The people in the United States were opposed to it. This is like a shotgun wedding where both participants did not want to participate. This is just outrageous. The day they announced the agreement, the stock market and peso dropped. That shows you that both business and government oppose this deal.

It is ridiculous that we are proceeding with this and continuing after all the signs in the market.

Rubin is a smart guy. He knows what the markets say is true and the markets are speaking and they say this is a bad deal, yet Rubin is proceeding with it. The reason he is proceeding with it is because it is not his money, it is the taxpayers' money.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yet the one thing we talked about earlier, you and I talked about at the press conference today, is questions need to be answered about why Mr. Rubin was so insistent that we use the exchange stabilization fund and that \$20 billion to send down there. A lot of people think it was because he was trying to protect his former company and his own headquarters because he advised those people to put their money down there to the tune of \$5.17 billion. And if he did it for that reason, that is certainly a violation.

Mr. STOCKMAN. He knows what is in that blind trust. He says it is a blind trust, but he just put it in that blind trust. He knows what is in there.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The people who may be paying attention in their offices, other Congressmen, need to know what you are talking about. He said he put his money into a blind trust so he did not know what that money was being invested in. But Goldman Sachs and he are very close. He was a partner in that company, and you are absolutely right, he does know in my opinion.

Mr. STOCKMAN. He is a financial expert. He knows exactly what is in there.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I appreciate what Congressman STOCKMAN and you have brought out here. But I think the problem the American public wants to know about is not only do we have a contract, or loan guarantees without Congress' intervention, we do not have the Border Patrol with the illegal immigration you spoke of, we do not have the reduction that we want to see in the illegal drug sales, and we also do not have, I do not think, any guarantee that the collateral is sufficient.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The collateral is not sufficient. Anybody who really knows what is going on with the oil sales in Mexico and that kind of a deal will tell you that if they were to default, and it is very likely that they will at least on a large part of this loan, or gift or whatever you want to call it, if they default, for us to take the revenues from their oil production, that State-owned oil company down there, would leave that company with

no money to operate the government. There would be absolute chaos down there, and we would probably see millions more people coming across that border because of the destabilization of the economy.

So that money that is being guaranteed from those oil sales to repay this loan in the event of a default, I do not think is going to be there. So the American taxpayer really in my opinion has no collateral whatsoever for this \$53 billion or \$54 billion loan bailout.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. As a result of your work on the committee, there is going to be, with the help of Congressman KING, an information request of the White House with regard to 80 or 90 pieces of information on what documentation they have to use the stabilization fund, what legal authority they are operating under, and when we get that information, what do you think we should be doing next?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think that information is essential, but in addition to that, we need to get Mr. STOCKMAN's bill to the floor which would stop this loan program completely. Because we represent the American people. And we cannot take care of a lot of the problems we have in this country. Right now, we are cutting spending dramatically. Six subcommittees of appropriations I understand last week cut \$17 billion out of programs here in the United States. That is \$17 billion. And while we are cutting U.S. programs, as we should, to get this Government under control and to reduce the size of Government, we are spending up to \$53 billion bailing out Mexico with no collateral. It makes absolutely no sense. None whatsoever.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to point out, too, that there is some critical factor here. The first request, a lot of people do not know this. There had already been \$17 billion put into the Mexican economy, they came back and asked for \$40 billion, now it is up to \$53 billion.

My question is, at what point do we say, \$100 billion, \$200 billion, at what point do we say we are throwing good money after bad?

This is a clear indication to me that the economy down there is unraveling. It is kind of like Visine, you stick it in your eye, it gets the red out but it comes back with a vengeance.

We are just postponing in my belief the inevitable, which is that the company and the bonds, the tsebonos, are going to default and I think we need to take that bitter pill now instead of having the American taxpayer take the bitter pill. I think it is outrageous.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I agree with my colleague entirely, and I cannot believe if there is a default on the loan that our Government and the people we represent are going to stand still for pouring good money after bad.

Mr. STOCKMAN. It is over \$100 million per district. I tell you, \$100 million, I could run a darn good campaign on that, too.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I hope everyone got that; \$100 million for every congressional district in the country is going down there.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, I would ask you or Congressman STOCKMAN, what would be the effect of your legislation with regard to this loan guarantee by the President which has been done?

Mr. STOCKMAN. What it would do is stop any loan guarantee, anything at all in the form of any kind of payments to the country of Mexico. This is not a racist thing. It has nothing to do with that. It is a financial deal. And the finances of it is that it is wrong for America.

In fact, I will tell you, it is on both sides of the aisle that oppose this, and I bet you if we put the bill to the floor, it would pass with flying colors with very little opposition.

This is a bill that just says, enough is enough. We gave them already billions and billions of dollars. We had the Brady bill, we had many other bills of rescue packages since 1982. In fact, seven packages, all have been rescuing Mexico, and each time we come back to the well.

We need to say to a country which has socialized industry, a lot of people do not know that. They have a nationalized oil industry, they have a nationalized, they are just unnationalizing their telephone company.

By the way, Rubin was the negotiator to unnationalize that. That is incredible. We are going through these series of processes and we are not looking at what the country is doing.

Let's face it. Just today we found out that the brother is connected to the murder. This country is not the same country as the United States. We are dealing with a totally different Third-World country. We are not even bailing out Orange County. Yet we are bailing out Mexico. I just find it appalling. But the bill would stop it all.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Your bill would stop it immediately.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Immediately. The only way that he could get around it is if Clinton vetoed it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The interesting thing about Mr. Rubin is that one of the clients that he represented was the Mexican Government itself. I mean, that was one of his clients when he was with Goldman Sachs.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I think he is still representing them.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Right. And here he was representing the Mexican Government with his company Goldman Sachs and now as Treasury Secretary, he is putting all this money down there, taxpayers' money. There is a conflict, there is no question.

Mr. STOCKMAN. He came before our committee, and I asked him, I said,

"Who is the No. 1 adviser to the President on this issue?"

He said, "I am."

I said, "Did you receive any calls from outside interests?"

At first he said no. He said, "Yes, I think I did."

I think we need to know who that was and what they discussed.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. He did not testify the outside person?

Mr. STOCKMAN. No, he did not.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Were any of them the people that paid him \$26 million in salary last year?

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is all you need is one phone call from them.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Anything else from my colleague?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Yes, I would ask the Congressman, at this point where can the public help you and help us move forward in this debate?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would say to my colleague and all of the Members here, if their constituents were interested, I would urge them to contact their Congressman, their Senator, and the White House and say, we want an up-or-down vote in the U.S. House of Representatives just like the votes are taken on any appropriation bill, any spending bill. There needs to be an up-or-down vote on whether or not our Congressmen and our Senators want to send this amount of money to Mexico as a bailout. And if the American people scream loudly enough, then I think there is a real possibility that Mr. STOCKMAN's bill will not only come to the floor but it will pass the House and pass the Senate and we will stop this nonsense very quickly.

There is a question about what is going to happen if we cut off these funds. There could very well be some upheaval down there. But I believe that upheaval is likely to take place, anyhow, and what we are doing is throwing good money after bad and the American taxpayer is going to lose this money and they are still going to have these problems.

If they are going to have those problems, anyhow, we might as well let them happen and deal with them as they happen and save the taxpayer this money.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I would like to point out that \$53 billion would buy an incredible fence.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am not sure that we want to build a fence between us and Mexico. But you are absolutely right.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Who is going to get us out when we collapse? We are arguing on the floor every day over a billion dollars. Yet we are doing \$53 billion. We are arguing over \$100 million. We are talking about, we are being accused of cutting school lunches. Yet we turn around and give \$53 billion. I think the upheaval will happen here if we collapse and we cannot handle ourselves.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think the American people, it is hard for them to comprehend 53,000 million. It is not 53 million, it is 53,000 million dollars total that you are talking about. And the American people, I think many people cannot comprehend that amount of money. But when you think about the national debt being what it is and the deficit being what it is and what we are going to face in the next few years if we do not get control of spending and here we are taking all this money that could be used to reduce the deficit or be used for projects here in the United States like in Orange County where they have got a terrible problem, or maybe in your district, yours or mine, and we are sending it down there, the American people I think would be very, very upset.

The problem is, they need to know about it and they really have not I think heard enough about this issue.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I am offering to pay my staff now in pesos. I think it is a fair deal.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Very good.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I think the fact is that your dialog tonight with our colleagues here on the House floor and hopefully Members of the public who may be listening along here in the gallery will find that in fact this dialog is important, because here we have an opportunity to look at America's needs first. And while we are looking to trim our government here in the Contract With America, let's look to see what America's needs are first and when we get involved with any other country, and we can do that, let's do it in a way that Congress has the involvement, that Congress is going to be obligated and we have the opportunity to make the conditions that are important to protect our American citizens.

It did not take place in this instance because the White House, I believe, had an overreaching.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. They usurped the authority of the spending house of the Congress, the U.S. House of Representatives.

We spend about \$13 or \$14 billion a year all over the world in foreign aid, \$13 or \$14 billion, maybe \$15 billion total in foreign aid and our constituents holler to high heaven when we have town meetings about the foreign aid. They say, "Why are you sending that money overseas when we have these problems here at home?"

And that is \$14 billion. Here in one country we are talking about as much as \$53 billion or almost four times, about four times what we are spending in all the foreign aid all around the world. So this is really a debacle. And the President has taken this upon himself without any act of the Congress.

One of the things that is interesting about President Clinton is that he decided to go into Haiti when he knew the Congress would not support that. If you have been to Haiti, you know it is a real mess and we are going to spend

a billion and a half dollars at least down there.

In the Mexican bailout, he took that action unilaterally. There have been other cases where the Congress was not consulted where we should have been. It just seems to me that a message needs to be sent down to the White House very clearly that this is a republic, not a dictatorship, and the President should not be doing these things unilaterally and we need to express that very clearly.

That is why it is extremely important tomorrow when we have our Republican conference that we get all of our colleagues there to try to make sure that we are allowed to bring a bill to the floor so we can have an up-or-down vote on this issue.

Mr. STOCKMAN. It is H.R. 480, by the way.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. H.R. 480. You have me on as a cosponsor, I hope?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes, sir, right there at the top.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Very good.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I just want to thank the gentleman for bringing this to light and your efforts and your guidance. As a freshman we oftentimes do not know what to do here. We are real frustrated.

I know I was talking with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and we were pleased that you helped on the leadership on this and really told us which way to go. A lot of times, you are new here, you do not know it. You have really taken this thing forward. I just want to thank you publicly for your leadership and for your guidance on this. I really appreciate it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I appreciate that very much. But if it was not for you introducing the bill and working so hard getting all those cosigners on that letter, we would not be at this point right now. But the battle is not

over. We need to fight very hard in the next few days to bring a bill to the floor so we can have an up-or-down vote. If we do that, get it to the floor, it will pass and it will pass, as you said, handily.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I also wanted to join the gentleman from Texas in acknowledging our appreciation for your leadership in this. We look forward to working with you in committee for a positive result for the people.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Thank you very much.

As we conclude, Mr. Speaker, this special order, let me just say there are a lot of issues we have raised tonight. I hope my colleagues will pay attention to all of those as well as anybody else that might be paying attention.

There are so many things that have been going wrong with this administration that need to be corrected. We as a Congress need to exert our oversight rights to make sure that the American people are well-represented.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

Re Request for a Independent Counsel to Investigate the Financial Holdings and Activities of Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown.

Hon. JANET RENO,  
*Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL RENO: For over a year, I, as then-Ranking Member of the Government Operations Committee and now as Chairman of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, have been conducting an investigation into the financial holdings and activities of Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown, pursuant to my authority under Rules X and XI of the House of Representatives. And, for over a year, in response to direct questions posed to the Secretary, I have received inaccurate, incomplete, and misleading responses, or no response at all.

This investigation has developed specific allegations which the Committee believes are sufficient to warrant the appointment of an Independent Counsel. As you have previously determined that Secretary Brown is a "covered individual" under the Independent Counsel Act, 28 U.S.C. §591 et. seq., the Committee requests that you add the allegations set forth in the attached appendix to those matters already under review as part of your preliminary investigation.

The allegations are divided into five categories: (I) Submission of Incomplete, Inaccurate and Misleading Financial Disclosure Statements; (II) Supplementation of Salary; (III) Potential Conflicts of Interest (IV) Misinformation to Congress, and; (V) Refusing to Respond to Congress. Under each category are specific allegations followed by a factual basis for each assertion and the relevant statutory and regulatory citations. In some instances, the factual basis for an allegation is reiterated under more than one category because the facts support multiple allegations.

As requested in Deputy Assistant Attorney General John Keeney's letter of February 23, 1995 to me, I will provide to your office copies of the documents obtained to date in the investigation of Secretary Brown. These documents serve as the underlying support for the allegations set forth in the attached appendix. I expect to complete that process not later than March 10, 1995.

Some of the information obtained during our investigation was provided by confidential sources. These documents will be identified for your information. Because I pledged anonymity in consideration of this material, I am not prepared to reveal the identity of the sources at this time.

Please understand that the Committee will continue its investigation. As new information is developed, and adequately substantiated, we will provide it to you. Although I do not presently plan to hold hearings on this matter, I reserve the right to schedule hearings as circumstances warrant.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr.,  
*Chairman.*

Enclosure.

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 2, 1995, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

## MEETINGS SCHEDULED

## MARCH 3

9:30 a.m.

## Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Credit Union Administration, the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Resolution Trust Corporation-Inspector General.

SD-138

10:00 a.m.

## Appropriations

## Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on security cooperation in Europe.

SD-192

## Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine proposals to reform Federal habeas corpus regulations, focusing on the elimination of prisoners' abuse of the judicial process.

SD-226

## MARCH 6

10:00 a.m.

## Joint Library

Organizational meeting to consider pending committee business.

SR-301

2:00 p.m.

## Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

SD-192

## Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S. 333, to direct the Secretary of Energy to institute certain procedures in the performance of risk assessments in connection with environmental restoration activities.

SD-366

## Joint Printing

Organizational meeting to consider pending committee business.

H-164, Capitol

## MARCH 7

9:00 a.m.

## Finance

To hold hearings on the FCC tax certificate program.

SD-215

9:30 a.m.

## Armed Services

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program.

SR-222

## Budget

To hold hearings to examine various privatization initiatives.

SD-608

## Energy and Natural Resources

Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Resources' Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Lands to review the health of the National Park System.

SD-366

## Environment and Public Works

Drinking Water, Fisheries, and Wildlife Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 191, to revise the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to ensure that constitutionally protected private property rights are not infringed until adequate protection is afforded by reauthorization of the Act, and to protect against economic losses from critical habitat designation, and other proposed legislation to institute a moratorium on certain activities under authority of the Endangered Species Act.

SD-406

## Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.

## Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Commerce.

S-146, Capitol

## Governmental Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 219, to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions.

SD-342

## Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the jury process, focusing on the search for truth in trials.

SD-226

## Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings to review Federal programs which address the challenges facing Indian youth.

SR-485

2:00 p.m.

## Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Labor.

SD-192

## MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.

## Appropriations

## Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

SD-116

## Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings on domestic petroleum production and international supply.

SD-366

## Governmental Affairs

To resume hearings on proposed legislation to reform the Federal regulatory process, to make government more efficient and effective.

SD-342

## Small Business

To hold hearings on the proposed "Regulatory Flexibility Amendments Act."

SR-428A

10:00 a.m.

## Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for rural economic and community development services of the Department of Agriculture.

SD-138

## Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To resume oversight hearings on the condition of credit unions.

SD-538

1:30 p.m.

## Foreign Relations

East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine intellectual property rights with regard to the People's Republic of China.

SD-419

2:00 p.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on Forest Service appeals.

SD-366

## Select on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.

SH-219

2:30 p.m.

## Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings to examine the structure and funding of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

SR-485

## MARCH 9

9:30 a.m.

## Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on cost issues of certain farm programs.

SR-332

## Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider the nomination of Wilma A. Lewis, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General, Department of the Interior; to be followed by a closed briefing on international aspects of petroleum supply.

S-407, Capitol

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| 10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Transportation Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Transportation Safety Board.<br>SD-192  | partment of Energy Office of Energy Research.<br>SD-192  | 10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.<br>SD-138   |
| Judiciary<br>To hold hearings on S. 227, to provide an exclusive right to perform sound recordings publicly by means of digital transmissions.<br>SD-226   | MARCH 15<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Interior Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Smithsonian Institution.<br>SD-116  | MARCH 23<br>10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Transportation Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, and the National Passenger Railroad Corporation (Amtrak).<br>SD-192   |
| 2:00 p.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Health and Human Services.<br>SD-138   | Energy and Natural Resources<br>Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.<br>SD-366   | 2:00 p.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and the United States Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.<br>SD-192  |
| Appropriations<br>Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Secret Service, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury.<br>SD-192 | Appropriations<br>Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Justice.<br>Room to be announced  | 3:00 p.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.<br>SD-138  |
| 2:30 p.m.<br>Commerce, Science, and Transportation Aviation Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings to examine activities of the Denver International Airport.<br>SR-253  | 2:00 p.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Energy and Water Development Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bonneville Power Administration.<br>SD-192  | MARCH 24<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.<br>SD-138   |
| MARCH 10<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Science Foundation, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy.<br>SD-138  | MARCH 16<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry<br>To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on taxpayers' stake in Federal farm policy.<br>SR-332  | MARCH 27<br>2:00 p.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Executive Office of the President, and the General Services Administration.<br>SD-138   |
| Joint Economic<br>To hold hearings to examine the employment-unemployment situation for February.<br>SD-562  | 10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Drug Enforcement Agency, both of the Department of Justice.<br>S-146, Capitol | MARCH 28<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Interior Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.<br>SD-116  |
| MARCH 13<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Finance<br>To hold hearings on the consumer price index.<br>SD-215  | Appropriations<br>Transportation Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation.<br>SD-192  | MARCH 29<br>10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, all of the Department of Agriculture.<br>SD-138 |
| MARCH 14<br>9:00 a.m.<br>Judiciary<br>To hold hearings to examine proposals to reduce illegal immigration and to control financial costs to taxpayers.<br>SD-226   | 2:00 p.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Education.<br>SD-192   |  |
| 9:30 a.m.<br>Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry<br>To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on wetlands and farm policy.<br>SR-332   | MARCH 22<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Interior Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.<br>SD-192  |  |
| Appropriations<br>Defense Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense.<br>SD-138  |  |  |
| Appropriations<br>Energy and Water Development Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the De-  |  |  |



|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Appropriations<br>Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary<br>Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts, and the Judicial Conference.<br>S-146, Capitol   | tional Aeronautics and Space Administration.<br>SD-192  | eral Transit Administration, Department of Transportation.<br>SD-192  |
| MARCH 30   | 10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Economic Research Service, and the National Agricultural Statistics Service, all of the Department of Agriculture.<br>SD-138 | MAY 2<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Interior Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.<br>SD-138  |
| 9:30 a.m.<br>Veterans' Affairs<br>To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of AMVETS, American Ex-Prisoners of War, Vietnam Veterans of America, Blinded Veterans Association, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart.<br>345 Cannon Building | Appropriations<br>Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Bureau of Prisons, both of the Department of Justice.<br>S-146, Capitol  | MAY 3<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Environmental Protection Agency, the Council on Environmental Quality, and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.<br>SD-192 |
| 10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Transportation Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.<br>SD-192   | APRIL 6<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency.<br>SD-138   | 10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Agriculture.<br>SD-138  |
| MARCH 31<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry<br>To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on agricultural credit.<br>SR-332  | 2:00 p.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget.<br>SD-116  | MAY 4<br>10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Transportation Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.<br>SD-192   |
| Appropriations<br>VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Court of Veteran's Appeals, and Veterans Affairs Service Organizations.<br>SD-138   | APRIL 26<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Interior Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for energy conservation.<br>SD-116   | MAY 5<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for Environmental Protection Agency science programs.<br>SD-138  |
| APRIL 3<br>2:00 p.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Personnel Management.<br>SD-138                              | 10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Food and Consumer Service, Department of Agriculture.<br>SD-138   | MAY 11<br>10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Interior Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.<br>SD-116   |
| APRIL 4<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry<br>To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on market effects of Federal farm policy.<br>SR-332   | Appropriations<br>Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Legal Services Corporation.<br>S-146, Capitol  | 1:00 p.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Interior Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.<br>SD-116  |
| Appropriations<br>Interior Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.<br>SD-138   | 11:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Interior Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for fossil energy, clean coal technology, Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and the Naval Petroleum Reserve.<br>SD-116   | MAY 17<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Interior Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of the Interior.<br>SD-192  |
| APRIL 5<br>9:30 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Na-   | APRIL 27<br>10:00 a.m.<br>Appropriations<br>Transportation Subcommittee<br>To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Fed-  |   |